arXiv:0907.4720v2 [math.AG] 9 Nov 2009

SINGULARITIES OF FREE GROUP CHARACTER VARIETIES

CARLOS FLORENTINO AND SEAN LAWTON

Abstract. Let $\mathfrak{X}_r$ be the moduli of SL_n, SU_n, GL_n, or U_n valued representations of a rank r free group. We compute the fundamental group of $\mathfrak{X}_r$ and show that these four moduli otherwise have identical higher homotopy groups. We then classify the singular stratification of $\mathfrak{X}_r$. This comes down to showing that the singular locus corresponds exactly to reducible representations if there exist singularities at all. Lastly, we show that the moduli $\mathfrak{X}_r$ are generally not topological manifolds, except for a few examples we explicitly describe.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathtt{F}_r$ be a rank r free group and let G be an affine complex reductive Lie group with K a maximal compact subgroup. Let $\mathfrak{R}_r(G) = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathtt{F}_r, G)$ and $\mathfrak{R}_r(K) = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathtt{F}_r, K)$ be the varieties of representations, and let G, respectively K, act by conjugation on these representation spaces.

Define the *character varieties* $\mathfrak{X}_r(K) := \mathfrak{R}_r(K)/K$ and $\mathfrak{X}_r(G) := \mathrm{Spec}_{max}\left(\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{R}_r(G)]^G\right)$. In the first case, $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ is the conjugation orbit space of $\mathfrak{R}_r(K)$ where $\rho \sim \psi$ if and only if there exists $k \in K$ so $\rho = k\psi k^{-1}$. In the second case, $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ parametrizes unions of conjugation orbits where two orbits are in the same union if and only if their closures have a non-empty intersection.

$\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ is a complex affine variety and has a well defined singular locus (a proper subvariety) which we denote by $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sing}$. In the other case, $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ is a semi-algebraic set and so embeds in a real algebraic set and so also has a singular locus $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)^{sing}$.

We will be mainly concerned with the cases when G is the general linear group GL_n or the special linear group SL_n (over $\mathbb{C}$), for which K is the unitary group $K = \mathsf{U}_n$ or the special unitary group SU_n, respectively.

In these cases a representation ρ is called *irreducible* if with respect to the standard action of G, respectively K, on $\mathbb{C}^n$ the induced action of $\rho(\mathtt{F}_r)$ does not have any non-trivial proper invariant subspaces. Otherwise ρ is called *reducible*. This allows one to define the sets $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red}$ and $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)^{red}$ which correspond to the spaces of equivalence classes in $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$, respectively $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$, that have a representative which is reducible.

Furthering our topological results from [FL09], we prove that both $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ and $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ are simply connected whenever K is connected and simply-connected itself. Using this result and an explicit description of $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$ as an $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)$-bundle over an algebraic r-torus, we are able to compute the fundamental groups of $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$, $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)$, $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)$, and $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$ as well as show that they all have identical higher homotopy groups. We are also able to establish that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$ has its singular locus determined by the singular locus of $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$ alone. These are the main results of Section 2.

It is straightforward to establish that $\mathfrak{X}_1(\mathsf{SL}_n) \cong \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ and $\mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{SL}_2) \cong \mathbb{C}^3$ are affine spaces and so smooth, and $\mathfrak{X}_1(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{red} = \mathfrak{X}_1(\mathsf{SL}_n)$. In [HP04], it is shown that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_2)^{sing} = \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_2)^{red}$ for $r \geq 3$. Likewise, one can establish that all irreducibles are in fact smooth, that is $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{sing} \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{red}$. In [Law07] it is shown that the singular locus of $\mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{SL}_3)$ corresponds exactly to the set of equivalence classes of reducible representations, that is, $\mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{SL}_3)^{red} = \mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{SL}_3)^{sing}$.

These examples generalize to our second main result:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $r, n \geq 2$. Let G be SL_n or GL_n and K be SU_n or U_n. Then $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red} = \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sing}$ and $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)^{red} = \mathfrak{X}_r(K)^{sing}$ if and only if $(r, n) \neq (2, 2)$.*

In fact we are able to use an induction argument to completely classify the singular stratification of these semi-algebraic spaces.

The proof and development of this result constitutes Section 3.

Theorem 1.1 is sharper than it might appear at first. Replacing $\mathtt{F}_r$ by a general finitely presented group Γ one can find examples where irreducibles are singular and examples where reducibles are smooth. On the other hand, changing G to a general complex affine reductive group, we find there are examples where irreducibles are singular. See Section 3.9.

A locally Euclidean Hausdorff space M with a countable basis is called a *topological manifold.* If, in addition, the neighborhoods are permitted to be half Euclidean then M is said to be a *topological manifold possibly with boundary.* In [FL09] we determined the homeomorphism type of $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$ in the cases $(r, n) = (r, 1), (1, n), (2, 2), (2, 3)$, and $(3, 2)$ where we showed all were topological manifolds possibly with boundary. In [BC01] it is established that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ are not topological manifolds when $r \geq 4$.

Motivated by this we conjectured in [FL09] and herein prove that the examples computed in [FL09] are the only cases where a topological manifold possibly with boundary arise, that is,

Theorem 1.2. *Let $r, n \geq 2$. Let G be SL_n or GL_n and K be SU_n or U_n. $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ is a topological manifold possibly with boundary if and only if $(r, n) = (2, 2)$. $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ is a topological manifold possibly with boundary if and only if $(r, n) = (2, 2), (2, 3)$, or $(3, 2)$.*

Theorem 1.1 and the observation that the reducible locus is nonempty for $n \geq 2$, does not immediately imply Theorem 1.2 since algebraic singularities may or may not be an obstruction to the existence of a Euclidean neighborhood. For example, both the varieties given by $xy = 0$ and $y^2 = x^3$ in $\mathbb{C}^2$ (or $\mathbb{R}^2$) are singular at the point $(0,0)$ but only the latter has a Euclidean neighborhood at the origin.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 constitutes Section 4.

It is interesting to note that since $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)$ deformation retracts to $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$ it must be the case that for $(r,n) = (2,3)$ and $(3,2)$ the non-Euclidean neighborhoods deformation retract to Euclidean neighborhoods. Curiously, these are the only cases ($n \geq 2$) where $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$ is a manifold *without boundary*, and both are homeomorphic to spheres (see [FL09] or Section 2.2).

To prove our main theorems we use slice theorems and explicitly describe the homeomorphism type of neighborhoods (showing them to be non-Euclidean) for a family of examples.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce our objects of interest, character varieties, discuss their singularities, and prove that their topology is strongly influenced by the topology of the maximal compact Lie group K. It is here that we are able to essentially reduce the study of algebraic singularities to those in $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$ alone. In Section 3 we prove necessary lemmas, including a brief review of a weak version of the celebrated Luna Slice Theorem, in preparation to prove our classification of the singular stratification. This directly generalizes some of the results of [HP04]. In Section 4, we discuss properties of compact quotients and slices to prove the classification of those moduli which are manifolds. In the Appendix, we clarify the distinction between trace varieties and character varieties, and then using a result in [Bai08] we give a new cohomology argument that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ are not topological manifolds when $r \geq 4$.

Acknowledgments

The second author thanks W. Goldman for introducing him to the general topic of character varieties and for helpful discussions. He also thanks the Instituto Superior Técnico for its support during the 2007-2009 academic years, and A. Sikora for useful conversations. This work was partially supported by the Center for Mathematical Analysis, Geometry and Dynamical Systems at I.S.T., and by the "Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia" through the programs Praxis XXI, POCI/ MAT/ 58549/ 2004 and FEDER.

2. Character Varieties

Let K be a compact Lie group and $G = K_{\mathbb{C}}$ be its complexification (complex zeros of K as a real algebraic set). Such groups are called *reductive* and are always complex affine algebraic.

For instance, $K_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathsf{SL}_n$ is the complexification of $K = \mathsf{SU}_n$, and $K_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathsf{GL}_n$ is the complexification of $K = \mathsf{U}_n$. Let Γ be a finitely generated group and let $\mathfrak{R}_\Gamma(G) = \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)$ be the G-valued representations of Γ. We call $\mathfrak{R}_\Gamma(G)$ the *G-representation variety of* Γ.

In the category of affine varieties, $\mathfrak{R}_\Gamma(G)$ has a quotient by the conjugation action of G, a regular action, given by $\rho \mapsto g\rho g^{-1}$. This quotient is realized as $\mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(G) = \mathrm{Spec}_{max}(\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{R}_\Gamma(G)]^G)$, where $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{R}_\Gamma(G)]^G$ is the subring of invariant polynomials in the affine coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{R}_\Gamma(G)]$. We call $\mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(G)$ the *G-character variety of* Γ. Concretely, it parametrizes unions of conjugation orbits where two orbits are in the same union if and only if their closures intersect non-trivially. Within each union of orbits, denoted $[\rho]$ and called an extended orbit equivalence class, there is a unique closed orbit (having minimal dimension). Any representative from this closed orbit is called a *polystable point.* For SL_n and GL_n the polystable points will have the property that with respect to the action of $\rho(\Gamma)$ on $\mathbb{C}^n$, they are completely reducible; that is, each decomposes into a finite direct sum of irreducible sub-actions (on non-zero subspaces).

Let $\mathtt{F}_r = \langle x_1, ..., x_r\rangle$ be a rank r free group. The *G-representation variety of* $\mathtt{F}_r$, and the *G-character variety of* $\mathtt{F}_r$ will simply be denoted by $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)$ and $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$, respectively. The evaluation mapping $\mathfrak{R}_r(G) \to G^r$ defined by sending $\rho \mapsto (\rho(x_1), ..., \rho(x_r))$ is a bijection and since G is a smooth affine variety, $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)$ naturally inherits the structure of a smooth affine variety as well. Since an affine (algebraic) reductive group over $\mathbb{C}$ is always linear, we can assume that G is a subgroup of GL_N, for some N, and hence $\mathfrak{R}_r(G) \subset \mathbb{C}^{rN^2}$. So, $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)$ also inherits the induced *ball topology.* It is worth noting that whenever G is an irreducible algebraic set, $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)$ is irreducible, and consequently $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ is irreducible as well. All complex affine reductive groups G are always reduced algebraic sets which implies $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ is reduced as well. We note that in the ball topology of $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$, i.e. the subspace topology induced from and affine embedding of $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ into $\mathbb{C}^k$ for large enough k, the moduli is Hausdorff and has a countable basis. Although the ball topology is dependent on an embedding a priori, an affine embedding corresponds exactly to a set of generators for the associated ring, but all choices result in the same homeomorphism type, so the ball topology is intrinsic.

For a compact Lie group K, we also call the orbit space $\mathfrak{X}_r(K) = \mathfrak{R}_r(K)/K$ a *K-character variety* of $\mathtt{F}_r$ despite the fact that it is generally only a semi-algebraic set. In this case, the topology, also Hausdorff with a countable basis, is the quotient topology. $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ is compact since K is compact. Likewise, it is path-connected whenever K is path-connected.

Definition 2.1. *Let $\rho : \Gamma \to G$ be a representation into a complex reductive Lie group. If the image of ρ does not lie in a parabolic subgroup* *of G, then ρ is called* irreducible *. If, for every parabolic P containing $\rho(\Gamma)$ there is a Levi L such that $\rho(\Gamma) \subset L \subset P$, then ρ is called* completely reducible.

For SL_n and GL_n the irreducible representations are exactly those that, with respect to their actions on $\mathbb{C}^n$, do not admit any proper (non-trivial) invariant subspaces. Any representation that is not irreducible is called *reducible.* Denote the set of reducible representations by $\mathfrak{R}_\Gamma(G)^{red}$. A point is called *stable* if the stabilizer is finite and if the orbit is closed.

The following theorem can be found in [Sik09], building on earlier work in [JM87, pages 54-57]. Let $\mathsf{P}G = G/Z(G)$ where $Z(G)$ is the center. Note that the action of $\mathsf{P}G$ and G define the same GIT quotients and the same orbit spaces and thus, since the $\mathsf{P}G$ action is effective, we will often consider this action.

Theorem 2.2 ([JM87, Sik09]). *Let G be reductive. The irreducibles are exactly the stable points under the action of $\mathsf{P}G$ on $\mathfrak{R}_\Gamma(G)$. Moreover, the completely reducibles are the polystable points.*

Definition 2.3. *The reducibles $\mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(G)^{red}$ are the image of the projection*

$$\mathfrak{R}_\Gamma(G)^{red} \subset \mathfrak{R}_\Gamma(G) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(G).$$

Since $\mathfrak{R}_r(G) \cong G^r$ all points are smooth, and since $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ is an affine quotient of a reductive group, there exists $\rho^{ss} \in [\rho]$ which has a closed orbit and corresponds to a completely reducible representation. Thus, for G either SL_n or GL_n we can assume it is in block diagonal form. In other words, $\rho^{ss} \leftrightarrow (X_1, ..., X_r)$ where X_i all have the same block diagonal form (if they are irreducible then there would be only one block). These representations induce a semi-simple module structure on $\mathbb{C}^n$. We denote the set of semi-simple representations by $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)^{ss}$. We note that $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)^{ss}/G \cong \mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ since all extended orbits have a semisimple representative, and that the semisimple representations are also the completely reducible representations which are also the polystable representations. Likewise, we denote the irreducible representations (those giving simple actions on $\mathbb{C}^n$) by $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)^s$ and their quotient by $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^s$.

For free groups, a very concrete relationship exists between K-character varieties and $K_\mathbb{C}$-character varieties, as expressed in the following result.

Theorem 2.4 ([FL09]). *Let K be a compact Lie group and G its complexification. Then, $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ is a strong deformation retract of $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$. In particular, these character varieties are homotopy equivalent.*

2.1. **The Determinant Fibration.**

In order to compare SL_n-character varieties to GL_n-character varieties, the following setup will be useful.

The usual exact sequence of groups given by the determinant of an invertible matrix

$$\mathsf{SL}_n \to \mathsf{GL}_n \overset{\det}{\to} \mathbb{C}^* \tag{1}$$

induces (by fixing generators of $\mathtt{F}_r$, as before) what we will call the *determinant map*:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \det : \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n) & \to & \mathrm{Hom}(\mathtt{F}_r, \mathbb{C}^*) \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^r \\ [\rho] & \mapsto & \det(\rho), \end{array}$$

where $\det(\rho) = (\det(X_1), ..., \det(X_r))$, for $\rho = (X_1, ..., X_r) \in \mathfrak{R}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$. Note that the map is clearly well defined on classes. Considering the algebraic torus $(\mathbb{C}^*)^r = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathtt{F}_r, \mathbb{C}^*) = \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathbb{C}^*)$ as an algebraic group (with identity $\mathbf{1} = (1, ..., 1)$ and componentwise multiplication) it is immediate that the SL_n character variety is the "kernel" of the determinant map, $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) = \det^{-1}(\mathbf{1})$. Therefore, the sequence (1) induces another exact sequence

$$\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \to \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n) \overset{\det}{\to} (\mathbb{C}^*)^r . \tag{2}$$

In this way, SL_n character varieties appear naturally as subvarieties of GL_n character varieties.

Note also that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$ can be viewed as a $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathbb{C}^*)$- space, as it admits a well defined action of this torus. That is, we can naturally define $\rho \cdot \lambda \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$, given $\rho \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$ and $\lambda \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathbb{C}^*)$. Given that $\mathsf{PSL}_n = \mathsf{GL}_n /\!\!/ \mathbb{C}^*$, it is easy to see that the corresponding quotient is the PSL_n-character variety:

$$\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{PSL}_n) = \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n) /\!\!/ \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathbb{C}^*).$$

Also, GL_n^r is a quasi-affine variety of $\mathfrak{gl}(n, \mathbb{C})^r$. In particular, it is the principal open set defined by the product of the determinants of generic matrices. Since the determinant is an invariant function and taking invariants commutes with localizing at those invariants, we have

$$\mathbb{C}[\mathsf{GL}_n^r]^{\mathsf{GL}_n} \approx \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{gl}(n, \mathbb{C})^r /\!\!/ \mathsf{GL}_n] \left[\frac{1}{\det(X_1) \cdots \det(X_r)} \right],$$

where $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{gl}(n, \mathbb{C})^r /\!\!/ \mathsf{GL}_n] \left[\frac{1}{\det(X_1) \cdots \det(X_r)} \right]$ is the localization at the product of determinants.

We now prove how the fixed determinant varieties, complex and compact, relate to the non-fixed determinant ones.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\mathbb{Z}_n = Z(\mathsf{SL}_n) = Z(\mathsf{SU}_n)$. The following are isomorphisms:*

(1) $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n) \cong \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \times_{\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathbb{Z}_n)} \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_1)$

(2) $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n) \cong \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n) \times_{\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathbb{Z}_n)} \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_1)$,

the first in the category of algebraic varieties, and the second in the category of semi-algebraic sets.

Proof. We first note that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_1) \cong (S^1)^r$ and $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_1) \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^r$, and thus $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathbb{Z}_n) \cong \mathbb{Z}_n^r$, as the groups involved are abelian.

The determinant map (1) defines a principal SL_n-bundle $\mathsf{SL}_n \hookrightarrow \mathsf{GL}_n \to \mathbb{C}^*$, which also expresses $\mathsf{GL}_n \cong \mathsf{SL}_n \ltimes \mathbb{C}^*$ as a semidirect product since there exists a homomorphic section.

Let $\mathbb{Z}_n$ correspond to n^{th} roots of unity $\omega_k = e^{\frac{2\pi i k}{n}}$. As algebraic sets one can show directly, by the mapping $(A, \lambda) \mapsto \lambda A$, that $\mathsf{GL}_n \cong (\mathsf{SL}_n \times \mathbb{C}^*)/\!\!/\mathbb{Z}_n := \mathsf{SL}_n \times_{\mathbb{Z}_n} \mathbb{C}^*$ where $\mathbb{Z}_n$ acts by $\omega_k \cdot (g, \lambda) = (g\omega_k, \omega_k^{-1}\lambda)$ and $\mathbb{C}^*$ is the center of GL_n. This implies that as algebraic sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n) &\cong ((\mathsf{SL}_n \times \mathbb{C}^*)/\!\!/\mathbb{Z}_n)^r/\!\!/\mathsf{SL}_n \\ &\cong (\mathsf{SL}_n^r \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^r)/\!\!/\mathbb{Z}_n^r)/\!\!/\mathsf{SL}_n \\ &\cong (\mathsf{SL}_n^r \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^r)/\!\!/\mathsf{SL}_n)/\!\!/\mathbb{Z}_n^r \\ &\cong \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \times_{\mathbb{Z}_n^r} (\mathbb{C}^*)^r, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

since the action of $\mathbb{Z}_n^r$ commutes with the action of SL_n which is trivial on $(\mathbb{C}^*)^r$.

In the same way we obtain the additional “twisted product” isomorphism $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n) \cong \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n) \times_{\mathbb{Z}_n^r} (S^1)^r$. □

This result provides an explicit way to write $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$ as a $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)$-bundle over the algebraic r-torus $(\mathbb{C}^*)^r$ and $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)$ as a $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$-bundle over the geometric r-torus $(S^1)^r$.

There are a number of consequences to Theorem 2.5. However, we first establish an interesting and general topological fact.

Theorem 2.6. *If K is a connected and simply connected compact Lie group, then both $\mathfrak{X}_r(K_{\mathbb{C}})$ and $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ are simply connected.*

Proof. Since K is assumed to be connected and simply connected, $\mathfrak{R}_r(K) \cong K^r$ is simply connected as well. By Corollary 6.3 on page 91 in [Bre72] we conclude that $\mathfrak{X}_r(K) = \mathfrak{R}_r(K)/K$ is simply connected. By Theorem 2.4, $\mathfrak{X}_r(K_{\mathbb{C}})$ is likewise simply connected. □

In particular, $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)$ and $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$ are simply connected.

Corollary 2.7. *For $m \geq 2$ or $m = 0$,*

$$\pi_m(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)) \cong \pi_m(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)) \cong \pi_m(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)) \cong \pi_m(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)),$$

and

$$\pi_1(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)) \cong \pi_1(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{\oplus r}.$$

Proof. By Theorem 2.5, $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)$ is a $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$-bundle over a geometric r-torus, and so we compute the long exact homotopy sequence:

$$\cdots \to \pi_m(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)) \to \pi_m(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)) \to \pi_m((S^1)^r) \to \cdots \to \pi_0((S^1)^r) \to 1.$$

Using the fact that S^1 has a contractible universal cover which implies $\pi_m((S^1)^r) = 1$ for $m \geq 2$, one calculates in these cases $\pi_m(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)) \cong \pi_m(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n))$.

Both compact moduli spaces are path connected since they are compact quotients of path connected spaces which gives $\pi_0(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)) \cong \pi_0(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)) \cong \pi_0((S^1)^r) \cong 1$.

By Theorems 2.6 and 2.4, we additionally conclude from the same homotopy sequence $\pi_1(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)) \cong \pi_1(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{\oplus r}$.

Finally, by Theorem 2.4, for all m we have $\pi_m(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)) \cong \pi_m(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n))$ and $\pi_m(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)) \cong \pi_m(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n))$. □

Corollary 2.8. *$\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)$, respectively $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$, is a manifold whenever $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$, respectively $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)$, is a manifold.*

Proof. The action of $\mathbb{Z}_n^r$ is free and proper. □

Corollary 2.9. *$\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$ and $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^r$ are étale equivalent.*

Proof. First note that $\mathsf{SL}_n^r \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^r$ is smooth and hence normal. This implies (see [Dré04]) that $(\mathsf{SL}_n^r \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^r)/\!\!/\mathsf{SL}_n = \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^r$ is also normal. However, the GIT projection $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^r \to \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \times_{\mathbb{Z}_n^r} (\mathbb{C}^*)^r$ is then étale because $\mathbb{Z}_n^r$ is finite and acts freely (see [Dré04]). Then by Theorem 2.5 $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n) \cong \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \times_{\mathbb{Z}_n^r} (\mathbb{C}^*)^r$ which establishes the result. □

Corollary 2.10. *Let $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)$ and let $[\psi] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$. Then*

1. *$[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{sing}$ if and only if $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{sing}$*
2. *$[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{sm}$ if and only if $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{sm}$*
3. *$[\psi] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)^{sing}$ if and only if $[\psi] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)^{sing}$*
4. *$[\psi] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)^{sm}$ if and only if $[\psi] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)^{sm}$.*

Proof. First let $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)$. Corollary 2.9 tells that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^r \to \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$ is an étale equivalence and such mappings preserve tangent spaces, we conclude

$$T_{[\rho]}(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)) \cong T_{[\rho]}(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^r) \cong T_{[\rho]}(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)) \oplus \mathbb{C}^r.$$

By counting dimensions and noticing

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)) + r$$

results (1) and (2) follow.

Results (3) and (4) follow from (1) and (2) and the additional observations that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{X}_r(K_{\mathbb{C}})) = \dim_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{X}_r(K))$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}\left(T_{[\psi]}(\mathfrak{X}_r(K_{\mathbb{C}}))\right) = \dim_{\mathbb{R}}\left(T_{[\psi]}(\mathfrak{X}_r(K))\right)$. □

Corollary 2.11. *We have the following isomorphisms of character varieties,*

1. *$\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{PSL}_n) \cong \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)/\!\!/\mathbb{Z}_n^r$*
2. *$\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{PU}_n) \cong \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)/\mathbb{Z}_n^r$,*

the first in the category of algebraic varieties, and the second in the category of semi-algebraic sets.

Proof. From the previous theorem we have

$$\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n) \cong \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \times_{\mathbb{Z}_n^r} (\mathbb{C}^*)^r.$$

By quotienting both sides by $(\mathbb{C}^*)^r$ we can conclude $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{PSL}_n) \cong \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)/\!\!/\mathbb{Z}_n^r$. More precisely letting $\mu = (\mu_1, ..., \mu_r) \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^r$ act only on the second factor of $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^r$,

$$\mu \cdot ([(A_1, ..., A_r)], (\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_r)) = ([(A_1, ..., A_r)], (\mu_1\lambda_1, ..., \mu_r\lambda_r)) ,$$

and going through the isomorphisms in Equations (3), one gets that the action on $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$ corresponds to scalar multiplication of each entry, so we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{PSL}_n) &\cong \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)/\!\!/(\mathbb{C}^*)^r \\
&\cong \left(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \times_{\mathbb{Z}_n^r} (\mathbb{C}^*)^r\right) /\!\!/(\mathbb{C}^*)^r \\
&\cong \left(\left(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^r\right) /\!\!/\mathbb{Z}_n^r\right) /\!\!/(\mathbb{C}^*)^r \\
&\cong \left(\left(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^r\right) /\!\!/(\mathbb{C}^*)^r\right) /\!\!/\mathbb{Z}_n^r \\
&\cong \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)/\!\!/\mathbb{Z}_n^r,
\end{aligned}$$

as wanted. The other statement is analogous. □

Finally we note that from results in [Bre72] and the above corollary $H^m(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{PSL}_n); \mathbb{Q}) \cong H^m(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n); \mathbb{Q})^{\mathbb{Z}_n^r}$ for all m, n, and r.

2.2. **Examples.** We use the results in Section 2.1 and the theorems from [FL09] to describe the homeomorphism types of the examples known to be manifolds possibly with boundary. Let $\overline{B}_n$ denote a closed real ball of indicated dimension, and let $\{*\}$ denote the space consisting of one point.

One can show (see [PS85]) that whenever $\phi : \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \to M$ is an isomorphism, then $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n) \cong \phi(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)) \subset M$ by restricting ϕ to $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n) \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)$.

We first consider the trivial case $(r, n) = (r, 1)$. In this case the conjugation action is trivial, and thus we derive:

	Fixed Determinant	Non-fixed Determinant
Complex	$\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_1) \cong \{*\}$	$\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_1) \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^r$
Compact	$\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_1) \cong \{*\}$	$\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_1) \cong (S^1)^r$

FIGURE 1. Moduli of $(r, 1)$-representations.

We next consider the $r = 1$ case. The coefficients of the characteristic polynomial of a matrix X, $\{c_1(X), ..., c_{n-1}(X), \det(X)\}$, define conjugate invariant regular mappings $\mathfrak{X}_1(\mathsf{SL}_n) \to \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ and $\mathfrak{X}_1(\mathsf{GL}_n) \to \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C}^*$ which are isomorphisms.

Thus we conclude:

	Fixed Determinant	Non-fixed Determinant
Complex	$\mathfrak{X}_1(\mathsf{SL}_n) \cong \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$	$\mathfrak{X}_1(\mathsf{GL}_n) \cong \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C}^*$
Compact	$\mathfrak{X}_1(\mathsf{SU}_n) \cong \overline{B_{n-1}}$	$\mathfrak{X}_1(\mathsf{U}_n) \cong \overline{B_{n-1}} \times S^1$

FIGURE 2. Moduli of $(1, n)$-representations.

Remark 2.12. *In this case there are no irreducible representations, despite it being smooth. For this reason these moduli should perhaps be regarded as everywhere singular, since we will see that irreducibles will generally be smooth points for* $r \geq 2$*.*

In the $r = 2$ case we have a surprising isomorphism $\mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{SL}_2) \to \mathbb{C}^3$ given by $[(A, B)] \mapsto (\mathrm{tr}(A), \mathrm{tr}(B), \mathrm{tr}(AB))$. More generally there is an isomorphism $\mathfrak{gl}(2, \mathbb{C})^2 /\!\!/ \mathsf{PGL}_2 \to \mathbb{C}^5$ given by

$$[(A, B)] \mapsto (\mathrm{tr}(A), \mathrm{tr}(B), \mathrm{tr}(AB), \det(A), \det(B)).$$

Therefore we tabulate

	Fixed Determinant	Non-fixed Determinant
Complex	$\mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{SL}_2) \cong \mathbb{C}^3$	$\mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{GL}_2) \cong \mathbb{C}^3 \times (\mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^*)$
Compact	$\mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{SU}_2) \cong \overline{B_3}$	$\mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{U}_2) \cong \overline{B_3} \times (S^1 \times S^1)$

FIGURE 3. Moduli of $(2, 2)$-representations.

In [FL09] the following fixed determinant cases are established.

	Fixed Determinant	Non-fixed Determinant
Compact $(3, 2)$	$\mathfrak{X}_3(\mathsf{SU}_2) \cong S^6$	$\mathfrak{X}_3(\mathsf{U}_2) \cong S^6 \times_{\mathbb{Z}_2^3} (S^1 \times S^1 \times S^1)$
Compact $(2, 3)$	$\mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{SU}_3) \cong S^8$	$\mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{U}_3) \cong S^8 \times_{\mathbb{Z}_3^2} (S^1 \times S^1)$

FIGURE 4. Moduli of compact $(3, 2)$ and $(2, 3)$ representations.

Remark 2.13. *The complex* $(3, 2)$ *and* $(2, 3)$ *cases are left out in the above description since we will show they are not manifolds. In each of these cases, the complex moduli space of fixed determinant is a branched double cover of complex affine space which deformation retract to a sphere. The explicit scheme structures are known as well. See* [FL09, Law07]*.*

This covers, as will see, all the cases where a manifold possibly with boundary can arise.

3. Singularities

3.1. **Algebro-Geometric Singularities.** There are a number of equivalent ways to describe smoothness for reduced equidimensional (having all components of equal dimension) affine schemes over $\mathbb{C}$. Since our objects of interest $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)$ and $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ satisfy these conditions, we will simply call a reduced complex finitely generated algebraic set (over $\mathbb{C}$) an affine variety.

Let $X = V(f_1, ..., f_k)$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then its tangent space at the point $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, ..., p_n) \in X$ is the vector space

$$T_{\mathbf{p}}(X) = \{(v_1, ..., v_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left.\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j}\right|_{\mathbf{p}} (v_j - p_j) = 0 \text{ for all } i\},$$

and for smooth points it is enough to generate this space with an appropriate subset of algebraically independent (maximally taken) generators. Such a set gives a transcendence basis of $\mathbb{C}(X)$ over $\mathbb{C}$ which determines the Krull dimension of X (denoted by $\dim_{Krull} X$), also equal to the maximal number of ideals in an ascending chain of prime ideals.

This coincides with the more general definition $T_{\mathbf{p}}(X) = \left(\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbf{p}}/\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbf{p}}^2\right)^*$ which is the dual to the cotangent space $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbf{p}}/\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbf{p}}^2$ where $\mathfrak{m}_{\mathbf{p}}$ is a maximal ideal in $\mathbb{C}[X]$ corresponding to $\mathbf{p}$ by Hilbert's Nullstellensatz. The maximal ideal is usually taken in the localization of the coordinate ring at the point $\mathbf{p}$, but it does not matter here since it results in the same space.

Definition 3.1. *The singular locus of X is defined to be $X^{sing} = \{\mathbf{p} \in X \mid \dim_{\mathbb{C}} T_{\mathbf{p}}(X) > \dim_{Krull} X\}$.*

The complement of this set, $X - X^{sing}$, is a complex manifold. If X is irreducible, then X is path-connected and furthermore $X - X^{sing}$ is likewise path-connected. See [Sha94].

Let $c = n - \dim_{Krull} X$, which is constant for our considerations. And let J be the $k \times n$ Jacobian matrix of partial derivatives of the k relations defining $X \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. We can assume n is minimal.

Then X^{sing} is concretely realized as the affine variety determined by the determinant of the $c \times c$ minors of J. This ideal is referred to as the Jacobian ideal, and will be denoted $\mathfrak{J}$. In this way, X^{sing} is seen to be a proper subvariety of X.

For example, in [HP04] it is shown (for $r \geq 3$) that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_2)^{sing} = \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_2)^{red}$. In [Law07], explicitly computing the Jacobian ideal, a similar result is also shown: $\mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{SL}_3)^{red} = \mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{SL}_3)^{sing}$.

3.2. **Tangent Spaces.** Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the Lie algebra of G. Having addressed the $r=1$ and $n=1$ cases, we now assume that $r, n \geq 2$.

The following two lemmas are classical, and in fact are true for any affine algebraic Lie group over $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$. See [Wei64]. For a representation $\rho : \mathtt{F}_r \to G$, let us denote by $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho}$ the $\mathtt{F}_r$ module $\mathfrak{g}$ with the adjoint action via ρ. That is, any word $w \in \mathtt{F}_r$ acts as $w \cdot X = \mathrm{Ad}_{\rho(w)}X = \rho(w)X\rho(w)^{-1}$, for $X \in \mathfrak{g}$. Consider the cocycles, coboundaries and cohomology of $\mathtt{F}_r$ with coefficients in this module. Explicitly:

$$\begin{aligned}
Z^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho}) &:= \{u : \mathtt{F}_r \to \mathfrak{g} \mid u(xy) = u(x) + \mathrm{Ad}_{\rho(x)}u(y)\} \\
B^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho}) &:= \{u : \mathtt{F}_r \to \mathfrak{g} \mid u(x) = \mathrm{Ad}_{\rho(x)}X - X \text{ where } X \in \mathfrak{g}\} \\
H^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho}) &:= Z^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})/B^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho}).
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let G be any affine algebraic Lie group over $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$.*

$$T_\rho\left(\mathfrak{R}_r(G)\right) \cong \mathfrak{g}^r \cong Z^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho}).$$

Let $\mathsf{Orb}_\rho = \{g\rho g^{-1} \mid g \in G\}$ be the G-orbit of ρ, and let $\mathsf{Stab}_\rho = \{g \in G \mid g\rho g^{-1} = \rho\}$ be the G-stabilizer (or isotropy subgroup).

Lemma 3.3. *Let G be any affine algebraic Lie group over $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$.*

$$T_\rho(\mathsf{Orb}_\rho) \cong \mathfrak{g}/\{X \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \mathrm{Ad}_{\rho(x)}X = X\} \cong B^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho}).$$

It is not always the case that the tangent space to the quotient is the quotient of tangent spaces. Just consider representations from the free group of rank 1 into SL_3. The ring of invariants is two dimensional and the ring is generated by $\mathrm{tr}(X)$ and $\mathrm{tr}(X^{-1})$. So the ideal is zero and the ring is free. Consequently it is smooth and the representation sending everything to the identity (having maximal stabilizer) is a non-singular point. This illustrates that there can be smooth points in the quotient that have positive-dimensional stabilizer. At these points, $T_\rho(\mathfrak{R}_r(G)/\!\!/G) \ncong T_\rho(\mathfrak{R}_r(G))/T_\rho(\mathsf{Orb}_\rho)$, seen by simply comparing dimensions.

We also note that if we replace free groups by finitely generated groups then the above isomorphisms require a more careful treatment due to the possible existence of nilpotents in the coordinate ring of $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)$ (see [Sik09]).

Recall that $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)^s$ is the set of irreducible representations, and $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^s = \mathfrak{R}_r(G)^s/G$. An action is called *locally free* if the stabilizer is finite dimensional and is called proper if the action $G \times X \to X \times X$ is a proper mapping. In general, the quotient by a proper locally free action of a reductive group on a smooth manifold is an orbifold (a space locally modeled on finite quotients of $\mathbb{R}^n$).

The following lemma can be found in [JM87, pages 54-57]. See also [Gol90, Gol84].

Lemma 3.4. *Let G be reductive and $r, n \geq 2$. The $\mathsf{P}G$ action on $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)^s$ is locally free and proper.*

Therefore, $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)^s/G = \mathfrak{R}_r(G)^s/\mathsf{P}G$ are orbifolds.

Lemma 3.5. *For* G *equal to* $\mathsf{SL}_n, \mathsf{GL}_n, \mathsf{SU}_n,$ *or* U_n *and* $r, n \geq 2$*, the associated* $\mathsf{P}G$ *action on* $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)^s$ *is free. Therefore, in these cases* $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)^s/G$ *is a smooth manifold.*

Proof. Let $\rho = (X_1, ..., X_r) \in \mathfrak{R}_r(G)^s$. Then by Burnside's Theorem (see [Lan02]) the collection $\{X_1, ..., X_r\}$ generates all of $M_{n\times n}$ as an algebra, since $r > 1$ and they form an irreducible set of matrices. Suppose there exists $g \in G$ so that for all $1 \leq k \leq r$ we have $gX_kg^{-1} = X_k$. Then g stabilizes all of $M_{n\times n}$.

Consider $M = \mathbb{C}^n$ as a module over $R = M_{n\times n}$. Clearly, M is a simple module since no non-trivial proper subspaces are left invariant by all matrices. Let f_g be the automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^n$ defined by mapping $v \mapsto gv$. Then f_g defines an R-module automorphism of M since g stabilizes all of R. Thus by Shur's Lemma the action of g is equal to the action of a scalar; that is, g is central. □

Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.16 (see section 3.4) together immediately imply the following corollary.

Corollary 3.6. *Let* $G = \mathsf{SL}_n, \mathsf{GL}_n, \mathsf{SU}_n,$ *or* U_n*. If* $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^s$ *and* $r, n \geq 2$*, then*

$$T_{[\rho]}(\mathfrak{X}_r(G)) \cong H^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho}).$$

For $G = \mathsf{SL}_n$ we can calculate that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^s = (n^2-1)(r-1)$ and for $K = \mathsf{SU}_n$, we have $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{X}_r(K)^s = (n^2-1)(r-1)$. Likewise, for $G = \mathsf{GL}_n$ we calculate $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^s = n^2(r-1)+1$ and for $K = \mathsf{U}_n$, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{X}_r(K)^s = n^2(r-1)+1$.

Let $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sm} = \mathfrak{X}_r(G) - \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sing}$ be the smooth stratum, which is a complex manifold, open and dense as a subset of $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$. The calculation of dimensions above and Corollary 3.6 imply the following lemma which expresses the fact that the irreducibles not only form a smooth manifold but are naturally contained in the smooth stratum of the variety.

Lemma 3.7. *Let* $r, n \geq 2$ *and* G *be one of* SL_n *or* GL_n*. Then the following equivalent statements hold:*

(1) $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^s \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sm}$
(2) $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sing} \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red}$.

The next lemmas address important technical points that we will need in our proofs.

Lemma 3.8. $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red}$ *is an algebraic set; that is, a subvariety of* $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$*.*

Proof. The irreducibles are exactly the GIT stable points (zero dimensional stabilizer and closed orbits) and in general these are Zariski open, which implies the complement is an algebraic set. □

Lemma 3.9. *Suppose there exists a set* $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sing} \cap \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red}$ *that is dense with respect to the ball topology in* $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red}$*. Then* $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sing} = \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red}$*.*

Proof. Since both $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sing} \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red}$ are subvarieties (by Lemma 3.8), $\mathcal{O}$ is dense in both with respect to the ball metric since it is dense in $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red}$ with respect to the ball metric and $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sing} \cap \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red}$. Thus $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sing} = \overline{\mathcal{O}} = \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red}$, where $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ is the metric ball closure of $\mathcal{O}$ in $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$. □

A set as in Lemma 3.9 is called an *adherence set.*

3.3. Denseness of reducibles with minimal stabilizer.

Now consider the following subvarieties of reducibles. Recall that the 0 vector space is not considered to be an irreducible sub-representation.

Definition 3.10. *Define* $U_{r,n} \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{red}$ *and* $W_{r,n} \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{red}$ *by:*

$$U_{r,n} = \{[\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n) : \ \rho_i : \mathtt{F}_r \to \mathsf{GL}_{n_i} \ \textit{are irreducible}\}$$
$$W_{r,n} = \{[\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) : \ \rho_i : \mathtt{F}_r \to \mathsf{GL}_{n_i} \ \textit{are irreducible}\},$$

where we consider all possible decompositions $n = n_1 + n_2$*, with* $n_i > 0$*.*

Note that a given $\rho \in U_{r,n}$ uniquely determines the integers n_1 and n_2, up to permutation. We will refer to this situation by saying that ρ is of *reduced type* $[n_1, n_2]$. Similar remarks and terminology apply to $W_{r,n}$.

It is clear that

$$\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{red} = \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{red} \cap \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \tag{4}$$

and that

$$W_{r,n} = U_{r,n} \cap \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n).$$

The following is likewise clear.

Lemma 3.11. *A representation* ρ *is in* $U_{r,n}$ *if and only if* $\mathsf{Stab}_\rho \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^2$*. Also,* $\rho \in W_{r,n}$ *if and only if* $\mathsf{Stab}_\rho \cong \mathbb{C}^*$*.*

The strategy is now to show that $U_{r,n}$ and $W_{r,n}$ contain only singularities. However, we must first establish the following lemma.

Lemma 3.12. *Let* $r, n \geq 2$*.* $U_{r,n}$ *is dense in* $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{red}$ *with respect to the ball topology.*

Proof. When $n = 2$, $U_{r,n}$ coincides with $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{red}$, since any completely reducible representation is of reduced type $[1, 1]$. So we assume $n \geq 3$. Let $\rho \in [\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{red}$ have at least three irreducible blocks; that is, $\rho = \rho_1 \oplus \rho_2 \oplus \rho_3$ where ρ_1 and ρ_2 are irreducible and ρ_3 is semi-simple. In other words, $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{red} - U_{r,n}$.

Then $\rho_2 \oplus \rho_3$ is a semi-simple representation into GL_k for some k. Since the irreducible representations $\mathtt{F}_r \to \mathsf{GL}_k$ are dense (here we use $r > 1$), there exists an irreducible sequence $\sigma_j \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathsf{F}_r, \mathsf{GL}_k)$ satisfying

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \sigma_j = \rho_2 \oplus \rho_3$$

which in turn implies

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \rho_1 \oplus \sigma_j = \rho_1 \oplus \rho_2 \oplus \rho_3 = \rho,$$

where $\rho_1 \oplus \sigma_j$ is in $U_{r,n}$. Thus we have a sequence $[\rho_1 \oplus \sigma_j] \in U_{r,n} \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{red}$ whose limit is $[\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2 \oplus \rho_3]$. This shows that $U_{r,n}$ is dense in $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{red}$ and proves the lemma. □

Corollary 3.13. *Let $r, n \geq 2$. Then $W_{r,n}$ is dense in $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{red}$ with respect to the ball topology.*

Proof. First we show that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{red} \subset \overline{W_{r,n}}$. Using the previous lemma and Equation (4), let

$$\begin{aligned}[][\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{red} &= \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \cap \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{red} \\ &= \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \cap \overline{U_{r,n}}.\end{aligned}$$

Then, we can write $\rho = \lim \sigma_j$, where $\sigma_j = \rho_1^{(j)} \oplus \rho_2^{(j)} \in U_{r,n}$ is of reduced type $[n_1, n_2]$. Let us write $\lambda_j := \det \rho_1^{(j)} \det \rho_2^{(j)}$. Since the limit is a well defined point $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{red}$, we can arrange for the sequence to be in $W_{r,n}$ as follows. Letting $\alpha_j = \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_j}\right)^{\frac{1}{n_1}}$ (for any choice of branch cut), we can also write $\rho = \lim \eta_j$ where $\eta_j = (\rho_1^{(j)}\alpha_j) \oplus \rho_2^{(j)} \in W_{r,n}$, (since now η_j has unit determinant), from which one sees that $\rho \in \overline{W_{r,n}}$, as wanted. Finally, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{red} &\subset \overline{W_{r,n}} = \overline{\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \cap U_{r,n}} \\ &\subset \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n) \cap \overline{U_{r,n}} \\ &= \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{red},\end{aligned}$$

which implies all these sets coincide, finishing the proof. Here, we used the standard fact that the closure of an intersection is contained in the intersection of the closures, and that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)$ is closed in $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$. □

3.4. **Luna Slice and the Zariski Tangent Space.** We now prove a strong lemma, first proved in [HP04] and later and in more generality in [Sik09], which tells exactly how to understand the Zariski tangent space at a general free group representation. For a similar result see also [Dré04, page 45]. To that end, we review the Luna Slice theorem [Lun73]. We recommend [Dré04] for a good exposition.

Theorem 3.14 (Weak Luna Slice Theorem at Smooth Points)**.** *Let G be a reductive algebraic group acting on an affine variety X. Let $x \in X$ be a smooth point with Orb_x closed. Then there exists a subvariety $x \in V \subset X$, and Stab_x-invariant étale morphism $\phi : V \to T_xV$ satisfying:*

(1) *V is locally closed, affine, smooth, and Stab_x-stable*
(2) *$V \hookrightarrow X \to X/\!\!/G$ induces $T_{[x]}(V/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_x) \cong T_{[x]}(X/\!\!/G)$*
(3) *$\phi(x) = 0$ and $d\phi_x = \mathrm{Id}$*
(4) *$T_xX = T_x(\mathsf{Orb}_x) \oplus T_xV$ with respect to the Stab_x-action*
(5) *ϕ induces $T_{[x]}(V/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_x) \cong T_0(T_xV/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_x)$.*

Remark 3.15. *The reader familiar with Luna's Slice Theorem may be wondering how the above stated theorem is implied. Firstly, note that ψ is an étale mapping if and only if the completion of the local rings satisfy $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_x \cong \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{\psi(x)}$ which implies the subset of derivations are isomorphic, the latter being isomorphic to the Zariski tangent spaces. The usual Luna Slice Theorem implies $\phi : V/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_x \to \phi(V)/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_x$ is étale, $(G \times V)/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_x \cong U \subset X$ is saturated and open, and $V/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_x \to U/\!\!/G$ is étale. We thus respectively conclude lines* (5)*,* (4)*, and* (2) *in the above theorem.*

Lemma 3.16. *Let G be a complex algebraic reductive Lie group. For any $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(G)$,*

$$T_{[\rho]}\mathfrak{X}_r(G) \cong T_0\left(H^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho^{ss}}})/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_{\rho^{ss}}\right),$$

where ρ^{ss} is a poly-stable representative from the extended orbit $[\rho]$.

Proof. Any $\rho^{ss} \in [\rho]$ has a closed orbit and is a smooth point of $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)$, and every point $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ contains such a ρ^{ss}.

By the Luna Slice Theorem, there exists an algebraic set $\rho^{ss} \in V_{\rho^{ss}} \subset \mathfrak{R}_r(G)$ such that:

(1) $\mathsf{Stab}_{\rho^{ss}}(V_{\rho^{ss}}) \subset V_{\rho^{ss}}$
(2) With respect to the reductive action of $\mathsf{Stab}_{\rho^{ss}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} Z^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho^{ss}}}) \cong T_{\rho^{ss}}(\mathfrak{R}_r(G)) &\cong T_{\rho^{ss}}(\mathsf{Orb}_{\rho^{ss}}) \oplus T_{\rho^{ss}}(V_{\rho^{ss}}) \\ &\cong B^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho^{ss}}}) \oplus T_{\rho^{ss}}(V_{\rho^{ss}}), \end{aligned}$$

since ρ^{ss} is smooth.
(3) Thus, $H^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho^{ss}}}) \cong T_{\rho^{ss}}(V_{\rho^{ss}})$, as $\mathsf{Stab}_{\rho^{ss}}$-spaces.
(4) $V_{\rho^{ss}} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{R}_r(G) \to \mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ induces $T_{[\rho^{ss}]}(V_{\rho^{ss}}/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_{\rho^{ss}}) \cong T_{[\rho]}\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$.
(5) $T_{[\rho^{ss}]}(V_{\rho^{ss}}/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_{\rho^{ss}}) \cong T_0\left(T_{\rho^{ss}}(V_{\rho^{ss}})/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_{\rho^{ss}}\right)$, since ρ^{ss} is smooth.

Putting these steps together we conclude

$$T_{[\rho]}\mathfrak{X}_r(G) \cong T_0\left(T_{\rho^{ss}}(V_{\rho^{ss}})/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_{\rho^{ss}}\right) \cong T_0\left(H^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho^{ss}}})/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_{\rho^{ss}}\right).$$

□

Remark 3.17. *Upon closer examination we find $H^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho^{ss}}})/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_{\rho^{ss}}$ to be an étale neighborhood; that is, an algebraic set that maps, via an étale mapping, to an open set (in the ball topology) of $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$.*

3.5. **The $\mathbb{C}^*$ action on cohomology.** As we saw in Corollary 3.13, the generic singularity will occur when Stab_ρ is the smallest possible torus group, namely $\mathbb{C}^*$ or $\mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^*$, for the cases $G = \mathsf{SL}_n$ or $G = \mathsf{GL}_n$, respectively.

To study the $\mathbb{C}^*$ action on cohomology, the following setup will be relevant.

Fix two integers $n, k \geq 1$. Consider the vector space $\mathbb{C}^{2n} = \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$ with variables $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) = (z_1, ..., z_n, w_1, ..., w_n)$ and the action of $\mathbb{C}^*$ given by

$$\lambda \cdot (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) = (\lambda^k \mathbf{z}, \lambda^{-k} \mathbf{w}). \tag{5}$$

Let us denote by $\mathbb{C}^{2n} /\!\!/_k \mathbb{C}^*$ the corresponding affine GIT quotient. It is the spectrum of the ring $\mathbb{C}\left[\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}\right]^{\mathbb{C}^*}$ of polynomial invariants under this action. To describe this ring, let

$$p(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) = z_1^{a_1} \cdots z_n^{a_n} w_1^{b_1} \cdots w_n^{b_n}$$

be a monomial, with $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{N}$, and define

$$\partial p := \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j - b_j.$$

Any polynomial invariant under the action is a sum of monomials p such that $\partial p = 0$. Considering the monomials with smallest degree, we are led to conclude that

$$\mathbb{C}\left[\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}\right]^{\mathbb{C}^*} = \mathbb{C}\left[z_1 w_1, ..., z_1 w_n, ..., z_n w_1, ..., z_n w_n\right].$$

Note that this shows that the quotient is independent of k. By viewing these n^2 generators as elements of a $n \times n$ matrix, $X = (x_{ij})$, $x_{ij} = z_i w_j$ which necessarily has rank at most one, we conclude that this is the ring of polynomial functions on the variety $V \subset M_{n\times n}(\mathbb{C})$ of matrices of rank ≤ 1:

$$\mathbb{C}\left[\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}\right]^{\mathbb{C}^*} = \mathbb{C}\left[V\right].$$

The variety V is called a determinantal variety ([Har95]) and one can show that $\mathbb{C}\left[V\right] = \mathbb{C}\left[x_{ij}\right]/I$ where I is the ideal of 2×2 minors of X. By simple computations, V has a unique singularity, the zero matrix, which corresponds to the orbit of zero in $\mathbb{C}^{2n}$.

Now, observe that all orbits of the action (5) are closed except the orbits contained in

$$Z := \{0\} \times \mathbb{C}^n \cup \mathbb{C}^n \times \{0\},$$

and moreover there is only one closed orbit in Z, which is easily seen to be the only singular point of $\mathbb{C}^{2n} /\!\!/_k \mathbb{C}^*$. Therefore, by GIT, the quotient

$$(\mathbb{C}^{2n} \setminus Z)/\mathbb{C}^*$$

is a geometric quotient. Summarizing these results, we have:

Lemma 3.18. *Let $n \geq 2$.*

(a) *$\mathbb{C}^{2n}/\!\!/_k\mathbb{C}$ is isomorphic to the determinantal variety of $n \times n$ square matrices of rank ≤ 1. Its unique singularity is the orbit of the origin.*
(b) *$(\mathbb{C}^{2n} \setminus Z)/\mathbb{C}^*$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{n-1}$.*

Because of the fact that the GIT quotient is obtained from $(\mathbb{C}^{2n} \setminus Z)/\mathbb{C}^*$ by adding just one point, the singular point, and because of (b) above, we will refer to $\mathbb{C}^{2n}/\!\!/_k\mathbb{C}$ as an affine cone over $\mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{n-1}$, and denote it by $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{n-1})$. It is called the affine cone over the Segre variety in [Muk03].

Now consider the following antiholomorphic involution of $\mathbb{C}^{2n} = \mathbb{C}^n \oplus \mathbb{C}^n$:

$$j : (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) \mapsto -(\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}),$$

and consider the same action as above, but restrict it to $S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}^*$. This will be relevant in the study of the compact quotients. The fixed point set of the involution j is the set

$$F := \{(\mathbf{z}, -\bar{\mathbf{z}}) : \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}\} \subset \mathbb{C}^n \oplus \mathbb{C}^n,$$

which is canonically identified with the first copy of $\mathbb{C}^n$ (as real vector spaces).

Lemma 3.19.
(a) *The S^1 action on $\mathbb{C}^{2n}$ commutes with j.*
(b) *The quotient F/S^1 of its restriction to F is homeomorphic to a real open cone over $\mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{n-1}$ denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{n-1})$.*

Proof. Proving (a) is straightforward, and we leave it to the reader.

To prove (b) first observe that on the fixed point set, the S^1 action just gives

$$\lambda \cdot (\mathbf{z}, -\bar{\mathbf{z}}) = (\lambda\mathbf{z}, -\bar{\lambda}\bar{\mathbf{z}}), \quad \lambda \in S^1$$

so we can describe it as an action of S^1 on the first copy of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Since the action is free except for the origin, all orbits are circles and the quotient $\mathbb{C}^n/S^1$ is the union of $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\} / S^1$ with a single point. Since $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \{0\} / S^1$ is homeomorphic to $(S^{2n-1}/S^1) \times \mathbb{R}$, we obtain that F/S^1 is the real cone over S^{2n-1}/S^1, the latter being well known to be $\mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{n-1}$. ☐

These singularity types will be encountered in SL_n and SU_n character varieties. In fact, the same singularities will also appear in GL_n and U_n character varieties, because the actions in these cases are very similar.

Indeed one can easily show the following

Proposition 3.20. *Let $n \geq 2$. Let $T = \mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^*$ act on a vector space $V = \mathbb{C}^{2n} = \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^n$ as follows:*

$$(\lambda, \mu) \cdot (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w}) = (\lambda\mu^{-1}\mathbf{z}, \mu\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{w}).$$

Then, $\mathbb{C}^{2n}/\!\!/T$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^{2n}/\!\!/_2\mathbb{C}^*$. In particular, as before, this quotient is the determinantal variety of $n \times n$ square matrices of rank

≤ 1*, which has dimension* $2n-1$*. Its unique singularity is the orbit of the origin.*

Proof. We just need to argue, as before, that the invariant polynomials are generated by the same monomials, those of the form $z_j w_k$, for any indices $j,k \in \{1,...,n\}$, so they form an $n\times n$ matrix with rank one. $\square$

Finally, note that for $n=1$, we get a smooth variety: $\mathbb{C}^2/\!\!/_2\mathbb{C}^* \cong \mathbb{C}$.

3.6. **Proof of Theorem 1.1: Case 1.**

Theorem 3.21. *Let* $r,n\geq 2$ *and* $G=\mathsf{GL}_n$ *or* SL_n*. Then* $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sing} = \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red}$ *if and only if* $(r,n)\neq(2,2)$*.*

Remark 3.22. *If* $n=1$ *the statement is vacuously true since in these cases there are no reducibles, nor are there singularities. We have already seen that there are smooth reducibles in the cases* $r=1, n\geq 2$*, and* $(r,n)=(2,2)$ *since there always exist reducibles in these cases and the entire moduli are smooth.*

Proof. Let $G=\mathsf{GL}_n$. By Lemma 3.7 it is enough to show $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red}\subset\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sing}$.

Let $\rho\in U_{r,n}\subset\mathfrak{R}_r(G)^{red}$ be of reduced type $[n_1,n_2]$ with $n_1,n_2>0$ and $n=n_1+n_2$ (see Definition 3.10) and write it in the form $\rho = \rho_1\oplus\rho_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \vec{X} & \vec{0}_{n_1\times n_2} \\ \vec{0}_{n_2\times n_1} & \vec{Y}\end{pmatrix}$, where $\vec{X}=(X_1,...,X_r)\in M^r_{n_1\times n_1}$ and $\vec{Y}=(Y_1,...,Y_r)\in M^r_{n_2\times n_2}$ and $\vec{0}_{k\times l} = (\underbrace{0_{k\times l},...,0_{k\times l}}_{r})$ where $0_{k\times l}$ is the k by l matrix of zeros. Recall that these representations form a dense set in $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red}$, by Lemma 3.12.

Let $\mathrm{diag}(a_1,....,a_n)$ be an $n\times n$ matrix whose (i,j)-entry is 0 if $i\neq j$ and is equal to a_i otherwise. Then $\mathsf{Stab}_\rho = \mathbb{C}^*\times\mathbb{C}^*$ is given by

$$\mathrm{diag}(\underbrace{\lambda,...,\lambda}_{n_1},\overbrace{\mu,...,\mu}^{n_2}).$$

We note that the action of the center is trivial so we often consider the stabilizer with respect to the action of G modulo its center.

Then the cocycles satisfy

$$Z^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_\rho)\cong\mathfrak{g}^r =$$
$$=\left\{\begin{pmatrix}\vec{A} & \vec{B}\\ \vec{C} & \vec{D}\end{pmatrix} \;\middle|\; \vec{A}\in M^r_{n_1\times n_1}, \vec{B}\in M^r_{n_1\times n_2}, \vec{C}\in M^r_{n_2\times n_1}, \vec{D}\in M^r_{n_2\times n_2}\right\},$$

which have dimension n^2r since this is the tangent space to a representation and the representation variety is smooth. The coboundaries are given by $B^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_\rho)\cong$

$$\cong\left\{\begin{pmatrix}A & B\\ C & D\end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix}\vec{X} & \vec{0}_{n_1\times n_2}\\ \vec{0}_{n_2\times n_1} & \vec{Y}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}A & B\\ C & D\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\vec{X}^{-1} & \vec{0}_{n_1\times n_2}\\ \vec{0}_{n_2\times n_1} & \vec{Y}^{-1}\end{pmatrix}\right\}$$

$$\cong \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \vec{X}A\vec{X}^{-1} & \vec{X}B\vec{Y}^{-1} \\ \vec{Y}C\vec{X}^{-1} & \vec{Y}D\vec{Y}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \right\},$$

for a fixed element $\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{g}$. It has dimension n^2-2 since it is the tangent space to the G-orbit of ρ which has dimension equal to that of the group minus its stabilizer.

Thus with respect to the torus action,

$$H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_\rho) \cong H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_1}) \oplus H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_2}) \oplus W, \tag{6}$$

where W exist since the torus action is reductive. Computing dimensions we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathbb{C}} H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_\rho) &= n^2r-(n^2-2) = n^2(r-1)+2, \\ \dim_{\mathbb{C}} H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_i}) &= n_i^2r-(n_i^2-1) = n_i^2(r-1)+1, \quad i=1,2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_\rho)/\!\!/(\mathbb{C}^*\times\mathbb{C}^*) = n^2(r-1)+1 = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{X}_r(G)$, since the diagonal of the $\mathbb{C}^*\times\mathbb{C}^*$ action is the center which acts trivially. We conclude that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} W = (n^2-n_1^2-n_2^2)(r-1) = 2n_1n_2(r-1).$$

Explicitly, the Stab_ρ action on $H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_\rho)$ is given by:

$$\mathrm{diag}(\underbrace{\lambda,\dots,\lambda}_{n_1},\overbrace{\mu,\dots,\mu}^{n_2}) \cdot \left[\begin{pmatrix} \vec{A} & \vec{B} \\ \vec{C} & \vec{D} \end{pmatrix}\right] \mapsto \left[\begin{pmatrix} \vec{A} & \lambda\vec{B}\mu^{-1} \\ \mu\vec{C}\lambda^{-1} & \vec{D} \end{pmatrix}\right]$$

which respects representatives up to coboundary.

So, the action on $H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_1}) \oplus H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_2})$ is trivial (but not so on W) so we conclude

$$H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_\rho)/\!\!/(\mathbb{C}^*\times\mathbb{C}^*) \cong H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_1}) \oplus H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_2}) \oplus (W/\!\!/(\mathbb{C}^*\times\mathbb{C}^*)).$$

Therefore, by Proposition 3.20, we have established that 0 is a singularity (solution to the generators of the singular locus) of $W/\!\!/(\mathbb{C}^*\times\mathbb{C}^*)$ which then implies it is a singularity to $H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathrm{Ad}_\rho)/\!\!/(\mathbb{C}^*\times\mathbb{C}^*)$ (whenever $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} W > 2$) which then in turn implies any $\rho \in U_{r,n}$ is a singularity in $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ by Lemma 3.16 (note $\rho = \rho^{ss}$ here). $U_{r,n}$ is dense in $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{red}$ by Lemma 3.12. Then Lemma 3.9 applies to show that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{sing} = \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{red}$ whenever $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} W = 2n_1n_2(r-1) > 2$; that is, whenever $(r,n) \neq (2,2)$.

Now let $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)$. Then it is easy to see that $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{red}$ if and only if $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)^{red}$. Then Theorem 2.10 and the previously established case together imply $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{red} = \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)^{sing}$.

This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1 for the groups SL_n and GL_n. □

Remark 3.23. *We note that the cohomology decomposition used in the proof depends on the decomposition of* ρ*. For instance, in the* 2×2

determinant 1 case, the reducible representation takes values in $\mathsf{SL}_1 \times \mathsf{GL}_1 = \mathbb{C}^0 \times \mathbb{C}^*$*, where* $\mathbb{C}^0$ *is a point. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} H^1(\mathtt{F}_r, \mathrm{Ad}_\rho)/\!\!/\mathbb{C}^* &\cong H^1(\mathtt{F}_r, \mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_1}) \oplus H^1(\mathtt{F}_r, \mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_2}) \oplus (W/\!\!/\mathbb{C}^*) \\ &\cong \mathbb{C}^0 \times \mathbb{C}^r \times \left((\mathbb{C}^{2r}/\mathbb{C}^2)/\!\!/\mathbb{C}^*\right) \\ &\cong \mathbb{C}^r \times \mathbb{C}^{2r-2}/\!\!/\mathbb{C}^* \\ &\cong \mathbb{C}^r \times \mathcal{C}_\mathbb{C}(\mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{r-2} \times \mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{r-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.24. *The above proof works directly, with suitable modifications for the case* $G = \mathsf{SL}_n$*. For instance the action of the stabilizer in this case is* $\mathsf{Stab}_\rho = \mathbb{C}^*$ *given by*

$$\mathrm{diag}(\underbrace{\lambda, ..., \lambda,}_{n_1}\overbrace{\mu, ..., \mu}^{n_2}),$$

where $\lambda^{n_1}\mu^{n_2} = 1$ *which is equivalent to* $\mu = \lambda^{\frac{-n_1}{n_2}}$*. The cocycles satisfy* $Z^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathrm{Ad}_\rho) \cong \mathfrak{g}^r =$

$$= \left\{ \left(\begin{array}{cc} \vec{A} & \vec{B} \\ \vec{C} & \vec{D} \end{array} \right) \;\middle|\; \vec{A} \in M^r_{n_1\times n_1}, \vec{B} \in M^r_{n_1\times n_2}, \vec{C} \in M^r_{n_2\times n_1}, \vec{D} \in M^r_{n_2\times n_2}, \right.$$
$$\left. \mathrm{tr}(A_i) = -\mathrm{tr}(D_i), 1 \le i \le r \right\},$$

which have dimension $(n^2-1)r$*. The rest carries over without significant change.*

3.7. **Case 2:** $K = \mathsf{SU}_n$ **or** U_n**.** Let $K = \mathsf{SU}_n$ and let $\mathfrak{k}$ be its Lie algebra.

The tangent space at a point $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ is defined from the semi-algebraic structure; that is, the semi-algebraic set $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ is a subset of the real points of $\mathfrak{X}_r(K_\mathbb{C})$ and as such has a complex Zariski tangent space (itself an algebraic set). We define $T_{[\rho]}(\mathfrak{X}_r(K))$ to be the real points of this complex algebraic set. At smooth points this corresponds to the usual tangent space defined by differentials.

The last cases to consider to finish the proof of Theorem 1.1 is $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ in terms of SU_n and U_n.

Theorem 3.25. *Let* K *be any compact Lie group. Then* $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)^{red} = \mathfrak{X}_r(K)^{sing}$ *if and only if* $\mathfrak{X}_r(K_\mathbb{C})^{red} = \mathfrak{X}_r(K_\mathbb{C})^{sing}$*.*

Proof.

1. $\mathfrak{X}_r(K) \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(K_\mathbb{C})$ (see [FL09])
2. K-reducible K-representations are $K_\mathbb{C}$-reducible (obvious)
3. $K_\mathbb{C}$-reducible K-representations are always K-reducible (see [FL09, Appendix])
4. $\dim_\mathbb{R} T_{[\rho]}\mathfrak{X}_r(K) = \dim_\mathbb{C} T_{[\rho]}\mathfrak{X}_r(K_\mathbb{C})$ (by definition)
5. $\dim_\mathbb{R} \mathfrak{X}_r(K) = \dim_\mathbb{C} \mathfrak{X}_r(K_\mathbb{C})$

□

Since we have already established in Theorem 3.21 that for $r, n \geq 2$ and $K \in \{\mathsf{U}_n, \mathsf{SU}_n\}$, $\mathfrak{X}_r(K_\mathbb{C})^{red} = \mathfrak{X}_r(K_\mathbb{C})^{sing}$ if and only if $(r,n) \neq (2,2)$, Theorem 3.25 is enough to finish the proof of Theorem 1.1.

3.8. **Iterative reducibles and the Singular Stratification.** Let the N^{th} singular stratum be defined by

$$\mathsf{Sing}_N(\mathfrak{X}_r(G)) = (\cdots((\mathfrak{X}_r(G))^{sing})^{sing\cdots})^{sing},$$

which is well defined since each singular locus is a variety and as such has a singular locus itself.

The N^{th} level reducibles

$$\mathsf{Red}_N(\mathfrak{X}_r(G)) = (\cdots((\mathfrak{X}_r(G))^{red})^{red\cdots})^{red}$$

is defined inductively in the following way:

Let $\mathsf{Red}_1(\mathfrak{X}_r(G)) = \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red}$. For $k \geq 1$ define $\mathsf{Red}_k(\mathfrak{X}_r(G))^{(k+1)}$ be the set of $\rho \in \mathsf{Red}_k(\mathfrak{X}_r(G))$ which is minimally reducible, that is has a decomposition into irreducible sub-representations that has minimal summands. We define $\mathsf{Red}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{X}_r(G)) = \mathsf{Red}_k(\mathfrak{X}_r(G)) - \mathsf{Red}_k(\mathfrak{X}_r(G))^{(k+1)}$ to be the complement of $\mathsf{Red}_k(\mathfrak{X}_r(G))^{(k+1)}$ in $\mathsf{Red}_k(\mathfrak{X}_r(G))$. Thus, $\mathsf{Red}_1(\mathfrak{X}_r(G))^{(2)}$ is always the reducibles that have exactly 2 irreducible subrepresentations–these are exactly the ones we considered in the proof of Theorem 3.21. More generally, $\mathsf{Red}_k(\mathfrak{X}_r(G))^{(k+1)}$ are the representations which decompose into exactly $k{+}1$ irreducible sub-representations. For example, $\mathsf{Red}_2(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_3))$ are the representations conjugate to a representation that has its semi-simplification diagonal, and $\mathsf{Red}_3(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_3)) = \emptyset$.

Likewise we have $\mathsf{Red}_N(\mathfrak{X}_r(K))$ and $\mathsf{Sing}_N(\mathfrak{X}_r(K))$.

Theorem 3.26. *Let $r, n \geq 2$ and $(r,n) \neq (2,2)$. If $N \geq 1$, then $\mathsf{Sing}_N(\mathfrak{X}_r(G)) \cong \mathsf{Red}_N(\mathfrak{X}_r(G))$ and $\mathsf{Sing}_N(\mathfrak{X}_r(K)) \cong \mathsf{Red}_N(\mathfrak{X}_r(K))$.*

The result follows by induction on the irreducible block forms and observing that each block form now corresponds to GL_k, or U_k in the compact cases.

3.9. **Remarks about other groups.**

3.9.1. *General reductive groups.* Let G be an affine reductive group. It can be shown (see [Sik09]) that the definition given before of an irreducible representation $\rho : \Gamma \to G$ corresponds exactly to the quotient group $\mathsf{Stab}_\rho / Z(G)$ being finite.

Using Lemma 3.16 we can conclude

Proposition 3.27. *A free group G-representation is smooth if and only if 0 is not in the Jacobian ideal of $H^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho^{ss}}}) /\!\!/ \mathsf{Stab}_{\rho^{ss}}$ which occurs if $\mathsf{Stab}_{\rho^{ss}}$ acts trivially which occurs if $\mathsf{Stab}_{\rho^{ss}}$ is central which occurs if the adjoint action of ρ is irreducible on $\mathfrak{g}$.*

Thus we conclude

Corollary 3.28. *For any complex affine reductive group G and any ρ that is irreducible and having central stabilizer, then ρ is smooth in $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$.*

A representation satisfying the conditions of the above corollary is called *good.* In other words, $\rho \in \mathfrak{R}_r(G)^s$ is good if and only if $\mathsf{Stab}_\rho/Z(G)$ is trivial. Letting $\mathfrak{R}_r(G)^{good}$ be the open subset of good representations, it easily follows that $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{good} := \mathfrak{R}_r(G)^{good}/G \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^s \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ is always a smooth manifold.

[HP04] shows that our main theorem, i.e. $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red} = \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sing}$, is not true for all reductive Lie groups G and free groups $\mathtt{F}_r$ since for PSL_2 there are irreducible representations which are singular. The issue is that the stabilizer of an irreducible representation, modulo the center of G, may not be trivial in general. This is not an issue for GL_n or SL_n since Lemma 3.5 shows the action is free on the set of irreducibles; that is, in these cases a representation is good if and only if it is irreducible.

Let O_n be the group of $n \times n$ complex orthogonal matrices, and let Sp_{2n} be the group of $2n \times 2n$ complex symplectic matrices.

Proposition 3.29. *There exists irreducible representations $\rho : \mathtt{F}_r \to G$ for G any of O_n, PSL_n, and Sp_{2n} such that ρ is not good.*

Proof. It is sufficient in each case to find, for some n, a non-parabolic subgroup of G whose centralizer contains a non-central element.

First consider a SL_2-representation ρ contained in the subgroup of diagonal and anti-diagonal matrices (containing at least one non-diagonal element and one non-central element). Then $\mathsf{Stab}_\rho/Z(\mathsf{SL}_2)$ is trivial, and so such a representation is irreducible. However ρ also determines an irreducible PSL_2-valued representations consisting of diagonal and anti-diagonal matrices. However, its stabilizer now contains $\begin{pmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & -i \end{pmatrix}$ since up to conjugation these elements act as scalar multiplication by -1 which is trivial for PSL_2-representations but non-trivial for SL_2-representations. This element is not central in SL_2. Thus ρ defines an irreducible representation into PSL_2 that has finite non-central stabilizer, and thus is not good.

For O_n representations consider any representation whose image consists of all matrices of the form $\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \pm 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \pm 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \pm 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$. One easily computes that the stabilizer is finite and not trivial and thus they are irreducible with $\mathsf{Stab}_\rho/Z(\mathsf{O}_n)$ not trivial and thus are not good.

For Sp_{2n} representations we can likewise find examples like the following for $n = 2$: let the representation have its image generated by

$$\left\{ \pm \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \pm \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -i \end{pmatrix}, \pm \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\},$$

then we get an order 16 subgroup with finite stabilizer and as such is an irreducible with finite non-central stabilizer. Again we see that $\mathsf{Stab}_\rho / Z(\mathsf{Sp}_{2n})$ is not trivial and thus this representation is not good.

□

Remark 3.30. *In the case of* PSL_2 *representations (and consequently for* SL_2*-valued representations) there are irreducible representations that act reducibly on* $\mathfrak{g}$*. However, for* PSL_2 *these are singular points, but for* SL_2 *they are smooth. This shows that* Ad*-reducibility does not imply non-smoothness in general. In fact, in* $\mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{PSL}_2)$ *there are simultaneously reducibles that are smooth points and irreducibles that are singular. See* [HP04].

Conjecture 3.31. *Let G be a complex affine reductive group. Then* $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{red} \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(G)^{sing}$ *for all $r \geq 3$ with equality holding if and only if G is* SL_n *or* GL_n.

We leave the exploration of this interesting conjecture and the description of singular irreducibles to future work.

3.9.2. *What if Γ is not free?* One may wonder what the relations exist, if any, between reducible representations and singular points in $\mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(G)$ for a general finitely generated group Γ.

With a given presentation of Γ as $\Gamma = \langle x_1, ..., x_r \mid r_1, ..., r_k \rangle$ we can naturally associate the canonical epimorphism $\mathtt{F}_r \to \Gamma = F_r/\langle r_1, ..., r_k \rangle$ which induces the inclusion $\mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(G) \subset \mathfrak{X}_{\mathtt{F}_r}(G)$ providing $\mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(G)$ with the structure of an affine subscheme. As such, ρ is irreducible (resp. completely reducible) in $\mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(G)$ if and only if ρ is irreducible (resp. completely reducible) in $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathtt{F}_r}(G)$.

However, the notion of singularity is very far from being well behaved:

(1) If Γ is free abelian then all representations are reducible and thus the singularities cannot equal the reducibles since the singularities are a proper subset. So reducibles can be smooth; in fact this example shows all smooth points can be reducible.
(2) The irreducibles are not generally all smooth in the representation variety let alone in the quotient variety; see [Sik09, Example 38]. Such representations can project to singular points in the quotient (as one might hope is the general situation). Therefore, there can be representations in $\mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(G)^{sing} \subset \mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(G) \subset \mathfrak{X}_{\mathtt{F}_r}(G)$ which are smooth in $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathtt{F}_r}(G)$.

(3) Singularities in the quotient do not necessarily arise from singularities in the representation space. For example, if Γ is the fundamental group of a genus 2 surface there exist representations in $\mathfrak{R}_\Gamma(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ that are singular but the quotient $\mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(\mathsf{SU}_2) \approx \mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^3$ is smooth. See [NS65, NR69].

(4) Theorem 3.16 and its generalizations (see [Sik09]) do not necessarily apply at a representation whose local ring contains nonzero nilpotents.

Therefore, when Γ is not free there is little one can say in general.

4. Local Structure and Classification of Manifold Cases

As stated earlier, in [BC01] it is established that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ are not topological manifolds when $r \geq 4$. They compute explicit examples where the representations (abelian, non-trivial) are contained in a neighborhood homeomorphic to $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{r-2}) \times \mathbb{R}^r$, where $\mathcal{C}(X) = (X \times [0,1))/(X \times \{0\})$ is the real open cone over a topological space X. From this characterization, simple arguments imply that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ is not a manifold for $r \geq 4$. It is also a consequence of the following criterion, which will be useful later.

Lemma 4.1. *Let X be a manifold of dimension n and let $d \geq 0$. If $\mathcal{C}(X) \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is Euclidean (i.e, homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{d+n+1}$) then X is homotopically equivalent to S^n (a sphere of dimension n). Also, if $\mathcal{C}(X) \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is half-Euclidean (i.e, homeomorphic to a closed half space in $\mathbb{R}^{d+n+1}$) then X is homotopically equivalent to either a point or S^n.*

Proof. Let p be the cone point of $\mathcal{C}(X)$. Using the natural deformation retraction from $\mathcal{C}(X) - \{p\}$ to X, we see that

$$\mathcal{C}(X) \times \mathbb{R}^d - (\{p\} \times \mathbb{R}^d) = X \times (0,1) \times \mathbb{R}^d \simeq X,$$

where $Y \simeq X$ symbolizes Y being homotopic to X. On the other hand, if $\mathcal{C}(X) \times \mathbb{R}^d = \mathbb{R}^{n+d+1}$ then $\mathcal{C}(X) \times \mathbb{R}^d - (\{p\} \times \mathbb{R}^d) = \mathbb{R}^{n+d+1} - \mathbb{R}^d \simeq S^n$.

The other statement follows in a similar fashion if the cone point is not on the boundary of the half space. Otherwise, $\{p\} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is contained in the boundary so extracting it results in a contractible space. □

4.1. $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$ and $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)$.

4.2. **Compact Quotients and Slices.** Let $K = \mathsf{SU}_n$ and let $\mathfrak{k}$ be its Lie algebra. Let $d_{r,n} = (n^2-1)(r-1) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{X}_r(G) = \dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathfrak{X}_r(K)$. Whenever $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ is not a topological manifold, there exists a point $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ and a neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ containing $[\rho]$ that is not locally homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{d_{r,n}}$, or $\mathbb{R}_+^{d_{r,n}}$ in the case of a boundary point.

We need a smooth version of Mostow's slice theorem (see [Mos57, Bre72]). Let $\mathcal{N}_x$ denote a neighborhood at x.

Lemma 4.2. *For any* $[\rho] \in \mathfrak{X}_r(K)$*, there is a neighborhood* $\mathcal{N}_{[\rho]}$ *homeomorphic to* $H^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})/\mathsf{Stab}_\rho$*. Moreover,*

$$T_{[\rho]}\mathfrak{X}_r(K) \cong T_0\left(H^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})/\mathsf{Stab}_\rho\right).$$

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{R}_r(K) = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathtt{F}_r, K)$. Since $\rho \in \mathfrak{R}_r(K)$ is a smooth point, $T_\rho\mathfrak{R}_r(K) \cong Z^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})$. Moreover, $T_\rho\mathsf{Orb}_\rho \cong B^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho}) \subset Z^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})$. Since Stab_ρ is compact and acts on $B^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})$, there exists a Stab_ρ-invariant complement W. Thus $Z^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho}) \cong T_\rho\mathfrak{R}_r(K) \cong B^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho}) \oplus W$, which respects the action of the stabilizer. Since $\mathfrak{R}_r(K)$ is a smooth compact Riemannian manifold we can invariantly exponentiate W to obtain a slice $\exp(W) = S \subset \mathfrak{R}_r(K)$ such that $T_\rho S = W$. Therefore, $T_\rho S \cong H^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})$ as Stab_ρ-spaces.

Saturating S by K we obtain an open K-invariant space, which contains the orbit of ρ since $\rho \in S$; namely $U = K(S)$. Since U is open $T_\rho U = T_\rho\mathfrak{R}_r(K)$, and since it is saturated $U/K \cong S/\mathsf{Stab}_\rho$ is an open subset of $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$.

Putting these observations together we conclude S is locally diffeomorphic to $T_\rho S$ which implies the neighborhood $U/K \cong H^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})/\mathsf{Stab}_\rho$, which establishes our first claim.

Then S/Stab_ρ is locally homeomorphic to $T_\rho S/\mathsf{Stab}_\rho$, which then implies

$$T_{[\rho]}\left(S/\mathsf{Stab}_\rho\right) \cong T_0\left(T_\rho S/\mathsf{Stab}_\rho\right). \tag{7}$$

But

$$T_{[\rho]}\mathfrak{X}_r(K) = T_{[\rho]}\left(U/K\right) \cong T_{[\rho]}\left(S/\mathsf{Stab}_\rho\right) \tag{8}$$

and

$$T_0\left(T_\rho S/\mathsf{Stab}_\rho\right) \cong T_0\left(H^1(\mathtt{F}_r; \mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})/\mathsf{Stab}_\rho\right). \tag{9}$$

Equations (7), (8), and (9) together complete the proof. □

Remark 4.3. *The above Lemma holds for all compact Lie groups* K*.*

Theorem 4.4. *Let* $r, n \geq 2$ *and let* $\rho \in \mathfrak{R}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$ *be of reduced type* $[n_1, n_2]$*. Then, there exists a neighborhood* $[\rho] \in \mathcal{N} \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$ *that is homeomorphic to* $\mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathsf{SU}_n}} \times \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{(r-1)n_1n_2-1}\right)$*, where* $d_{\mathsf{SU}_n} = (r-1)(n_1^2 + n_2^2 - 1) + 1$*. Also, if* $\rho \in \mathfrak{R}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)$ *is of reduced type* $[n_1, n_2]$*, there exists a neighborhood* $[\rho] \in \mathcal{N} \subset \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)$ *that is homeomorphic to* $\mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathsf{U}_n}} \times \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{(r-1)n_1n_2-1}\right)$*, where* $d_{\mathsf{U}_n} = (r-1)(n_1^2 + n_2^2) + 2$*.*

Corollary 4.5. *If* $K = \mathsf{U}_n$ *or* $K = \mathsf{SU}_n$*, both* $r, n \geq 2$*, and* $(r, n) \neq (2,2), (2,3)$*, or* $(3,2)$*, then* $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ *is not a manifold, nor is it a manifold with boundary.*

Proof. Theorem 4.4 implies that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)$ or $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$ are manifolds only if $\mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathsf{U}_n}} \times \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{(r-1)n_1n_2-1}\right)$, respectively $\mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathsf{SU}_n}} \times \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{(r-1)n_1n_2-1}\right)$, is locally Euclidean. By Lemma 4.1, this can only be the case if $n_1n_2(r-1) - 1 \in \{0, 1\}$, with $n = n_1 + n_2$ and $n_1, n_2 > 0$. In the first case,

$n_1n_2(r-1)=1$, which implies $n_1=n_2=1$ and $r=2$, so $(r,n)=(2,2)$. From Section 2.2 we know $\mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{U}_2)$ and $\mathfrak{X}_2(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ are manifolds with boundary, and we conclude the neighborhood in this case is half-Euclidean since $\mathcal{N}=\mathbb{R}^d\times[0,1)$, for appropriate d.

The other possibility is $n_1n_2(r-1)=2$ so that $n_1=2$ and $n_2=1$, or $n_1=1$ and $n_2=2$, and $r=2$. This is the case $(r,n)=(2,3)$. Otherwise, $r=3$ and $n_1=n_2=1$, which is the case $(r,n)=(3,2)$. Moreover, from Section 2.2 these two are the only cases which are manifolds without boundary.

Having exhausted all possibilities, the proof is complete. □

We now prove Theorem 4.4.

Proof of Theorem 4.4. Similar to Theorem 3.21, there is a direct computational proof of Theorem 4.4. However, using Theorem 3.21, Lemma 3.19 and the relation between K and its complexification, we can provide a shorter argument.

Let τ be the Cartan involution on $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{gl}_n$, the Lie algebra of GL_n, which is just the linear map $A\mapsto-\overline{A}^T$, acting on a matrix $A\in\mathfrak{gl}_n$. By definition, the fixed point subspace of τ is $\mathfrak{k}$, the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}_n$ of U_n. One easily checks that τ induces an involution on $Z^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})\cong\mathfrak{g}^r$, whose fixed subspace is $Z^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})\cong\mathfrak{k}^r$, and similarly $B^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})^\tau=B^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})$. This implies that τ induces an involution, also denoted τ, on the first cohomology, and that $H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})$ is naturally isomorphic to $H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})^\tau$.

Now, assume that $\rho=\rho_1\oplus\rho_2\in U_{r,n}\cap\mathfrak{R}_r(\mathsf{U}_n)$, is of reduced type $[n_1,n_2]$ $(n_1,n_2>0,\ n_1+n_2=n)$. Note that ρ_1 and ρ_2 are irreducible representations in $\mathfrak{R}_r(\mathsf{U}_{n_1})$ and $\mathfrak{R}_r(\mathsf{U}_{n_2})$, respectively, and with respect to the PU_n conjugation action $\mathsf{Stab}_\rho\cong S^1$. Then a cocycle $\phi\in Z^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})\cong\mathfrak{k}^r$ has the form

$$\phi=\begin{pmatrix}\phi_1 & A\\ -\overline{A}^T & \phi_2\end{pmatrix},$$

where $\phi_i\in Z^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_i}})$, and as in Theorem 3.21, A is now an arbitrary r-tuple of $n_1\times n_2$ matrices. This shows that τ respects the decomposition in Equation (6) , so we get

$$\begin{aligned}H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})=H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})^\tau &= H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_1}})^\tau\oplus H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_2}})^\tau\oplus W^\tau\\ &= H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_1}})\oplus H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_2}})\oplus F\end{aligned}$$

where, by the form of the cocycles above, we can write $F:=W^\tau=\{(\mathbf{z},-\bar{\mathbf{z}}):\mathbf{z}\in\mathbb{C}^{n_1n_2(r-1)}\}$; using also $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}W=2n_1n_2(r-1)$.

By Lemma 4.2, a neighborhood of ρ is locally homeomorphic to $H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})/\mathsf{Stab}_\rho$. As in the proof of Theorem 3.21, the action of

$\mathsf{Stab}_\rho = S^1$ does not affect $H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_i}})$, $i=1,2$, and we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_\rho})/\mathsf{Stab}_\rho &= H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_1}}) \oplus H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_2}}) \oplus F/S^1 \\ &\cong \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathsf{U}_n}} \oplus \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{n_1 n_2 (r-1)-1}), \end{aligned}$$

by using Lemma 3.19. The dimension d_{U_n} is computed by:

$$d_{\mathsf{U}_n} = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \dim_{\mathbb{R}} H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho_i}}) = (n_1^2+n_2^2)(r-1)+2.$$

The case of $K=\mathsf{SU}_n$ is similar.

□

Remark 4.6. *Note that using the identity representation (maximal stabilizer) results in* $H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{k}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\mathrm{id}}})/\mathsf{Stab}_{\mathrm{id}} = \mathfrak{k}^r/\mathsf{SU}_n$ *since the coboundaries are trivial. Removing a point results in a homological sphere quotient* $S^{(n^2-1)(r-1)-1}/\mathsf{SU}_n$. *If there was a Euclidean neighborhood about the identity, then this sphere quotient would be a homology sphere* $S^{(n^2-1)(r-2)-1}$. *We find this quite likely to give a different obstruction. At the other extreme (central stabilizer) the points are smooth and thus admit Euclidean neighborhoods.*

Conjecture 4.7. *If K is equal to* SU_n *or* U_n, $[\rho]\in\mathfrak{X}_r(K)^{red}$, $r,n\geq 2$, *and* $(r,n)\neq(2,2),(2,3)$ *or* $(3,2)$, *then there does not exists a neighborhood of* $[\rho]$ *that is Euclidean.*

4.3. $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)$ and $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$.

Theorem 4.8. *Let* $r,n\geq 2$ *and let G be* SL_n *or* GL_n . $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$ *is a topological manifold possibly with boundary if and only if* $(r,n)=(2,2)$.

Proof. By Remark 3.17, $H^1(\mathtt{F}_r;\mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{Ad}_{\rho^{ss}}})/\!\!/\mathsf{Stab}_{\rho^{ss}}$ is an étale neighborhood; that is, an algebraic set that maps, via an étale mapping, to an open set (in the ball topology) of $\mathfrak{X}_r(G)$. Thus we see that at a reducible with minimal stabilizer ($\mathbb{C}^*$ for SL_n and $\mathbb{C}^*\times\mathbb{C}^*$ for GL_n), that this neighborhood is étale equivalent to $\mathbb{C}^{(n_1^2+n_2^2)(r-1)+2}\times\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{(r-1)n_1n_2-1}\times\mathbb{C}\mathsf{P}^{(r-1)n_1n_2-1})$ in $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{GL}_n)$, where the cone here is the affine cone define over $\mathbb{C}^*$. In $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SL}_n)$ we have a similar neighborhood. Either way, these sets are not locally Euclidean neighborhoods for $r,n\geq 2$ unless $n=2=r$ which implies that $n_1=1=n_2$. This is seen by similar arguments given above in the compact cases. □

Appendix A. Trace Algebras and Character Varieties

In this appendix, we clarify the relationship between two distinct notions of "character variety" appearing in the literature, by showing these different definitions agree for some reductive groups and differ for others.

Let Γ be a finitely presented group and G be a complex affine reductive group. Then

$$\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{tr}(\rho(\mathtt{w})) \mid \mathtt{w} \in \Gamma] \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)]^G$$

where the action is by conjugation and $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)]$ is the coordinate ring of the affine scheme $\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)$. Recall $\mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(G) = \mathrm{Spec}_{max}(\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)]^G)$ is called the *G-character variety of* Γ. We note that $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)]^G$ can in principle have nilpotents so we are considering the geometric points of the affine scheme $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)]^G)$.

Given a presentation of Γ with generators $y_1, ..., y_r$, there is a naturally associated group epimorphism $\pi : \mathtt{F}_r \to \Gamma$ given by sending x_j to y_j for $j = 1, ..., r$. This induces inclusions of representation spaces $\pi^* : \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G) \subset \mathrm{Hom}(\mathtt{F}_r, G)$ and of character varieties $\pi_* : \mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(G) \subset \mathfrak{X}_{\mathtt{F}_r}(G)$ which in turn corresponds to the projection

$$\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Hom}(\mathtt{F}_r, G)]^G \to \mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)]^G. \tag{10}$$

Define $\mathfrak{T}_\Gamma(G) = \mathrm{Spec}_{max}(\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{tr}(\rho(\mathtt{w})) \mid \mathtt{w} \in \Gamma])$ called the *G-trace variety of* Γ. Generally, we have $\mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(G) \to \mathfrak{T}_\Gamma(G)$.

Theorem A.1. *For G equal to one of $\mathsf{SL}_n, \mathsf{GL}_n, \mathsf{Sp}(2n)$, or $\mathsf{O}(n)$ and for all finitely generated Γ, we have $\mathfrak{T}_\Gamma(G) \cong \mathfrak{X}_\Gamma(G)$.*

Proof. In general, if $f : X \to Y$ is a G-equivariant regular mapping of affine G-varieties, then if $f^* : \mathbb{C}[Y] \to \mathbb{C}[X]$ is surjective then $f^*(\mathbb{C}[Y]^G) = \mathbb{C}[X]^G$.

Let $\mathtt{F}_r$ be a rank r free group and $\pi_\Gamma : \mathtt{F}_r \to \Gamma$ be the projection associated with a generating set for Γ as above. Then, Equation (10) implies that $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, G)]^G$ is generated by traces whenever $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Hom}(\mathtt{F}_r, G)]^G$ is generated by traces.

Let $M_{n\times n}$ be the affine vector space of $n \times n$ complex matrices. Since G is affine it is linear and hence there exists n so $G \subset M_{n\times n}$ as an algebraic subset and hence $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathtt{F}_r, G) \cong G^r \subset M^r_{n\times n}$. This implies that $\mathbb{C}[M^r_{n\times n}] \to \mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Hom}(\mathtt{F}_r, G)]$ is surjective and hence $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Hom}(\mathtt{F}_r, G)]^G$ is generated by traces whenever $\mathbb{C}[M^r_{n\times n}]^G$ is generated by traces.

However the later was shown to be generated by traces of words in the case GL_n in [Pro76], which implies the same for SL_n since the conjugation actions are identical. More still in [Pro76], $\mathbb{C}[M^r_{n\times n}]^G$ is also shown to be generated by traces of words and their transposes for $G = \mathsf{O}_n$ which project to traces of words alone since orthogonal matrices are transpose invariant. Again in [Pro76] for $G = \mathsf{Sp}_{2n}$ the generators are traces of words and their symplectic transposes for which symplectic matrices are invariant. Thus again we have that these invariants project to traces of words, which completes the proof. □

We note that for SO_{2n} this theorem is false in general. For instance, since $\mathsf{SO}_2 \cong \mathbb{C}^*$ is abelian we conclude $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathtt{F}_r}(\mathsf{SO}_2) \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^r$. However, a few computations show $\mathfrak{T}_{\mathtt{F}_1}(\mathsf{SO}_2) \cong \mathbb{C}$; showing $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathtt{F}_1}(\mathsf{SO}_2) \ncong \mathfrak{T}_{\mathtt{F}_1}(\mathsf{SO}_2)$. On the other hand, the theorem is true for PSL_2 by [HP04].

Appendix B. A New Proof of the SU_2 Case

In this appendix we show how Tom Baird's computation (see [Bai08]) of the Poincaré polynomials of $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2) = \mathsf{SU}_2^r/\mathsf{SU}_2$ implies immediately that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ is not a topological manifold (locally homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{3r-3}$) for $r \geq 4$. In fact, we wish to establish that it is also not a topological manifold with boundary.

To simplify the presentation, consider the following polynomials in the variable t:

$$\begin{aligned} f_r(t) &= \frac{1}{2}\left[(1+t)^r(1+t^2) - (1-t)^r(1-t^2)\right] \\ h_r(t) &= (1+t^3)^r. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition B.1 (T. Baird, 2008)**.** *The Poincaré polynomials of* $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ *are:*

$$P_t(\mathfrak{X}_{r,2}) = 1 + t + \frac{t\ Q(t)}{1-t^4}, \qquad \text{where } Q(t) = t^2\ f_r(t) - h_r(t).$$

As particular cases, one can easily compute that, for $r = 1, 2, 3$ and 4, we have $P_t(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)) = 1, 1, 1 + t^6$ and $1 + 4t^6 + t^9$, respectively.

Let us first check that P_t is indeed a polynomial in t with non-negative integer coefficients. This follows from an alternative way to write P_t which will be useful later. Denote by $\binom{r}{k}$ the binomial coefficient, with the convention that $\binom{r}{k} = 0$ for $r < k$.

Lemma B.2. *We have*

$$P_t(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)) = 1 + a(t) + b(t),$$

where a, b *are given by the finite series*

$$a(t) = \sum_{k=1} \binom{r}{2k+1} t^{2k+4} \frac{1-t^{4k}}{1-t^4} \tag{11}$$

and

$$b(t) = \sum_{k=1} \binom{r}{2k+2} t^{2k+7} \frac{1-t^{4k}}{1-t^4}, \tag{12}$$

where

$$\frac{1-t^{4k}}{1-t^4} = 1 + t^4 + t^8 + \cdots + t^{4k-4}.$$

Proof. We can write $f_r(t) = rt+\binom{r}{3}t^3+\binom{r}{5}t^5+\cdots+t^2+\binom{r}{2}t^4+\binom{r}{4}t^6+\cdots$ and $h_r(t) = 1+\binom{r}{3}t^3+\binom{r}{6}t^6+\cdots+t^{3r}$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} Q(t) = t^2 f_r(t) - h_r(t) &= -1+t^4+\binom{r}{3}(t^5-t^9)+\binom{r}{5}(t^7-t^{15})+\ldots \\ &\quad \cdots+\binom{r}{4}(t^8-t^{12})+\binom{r}{6}(t^{10}-t^{18})+\cdots \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} t\,Q(t) &= -t(1-t^4)+\binom{r}{3}t^6(1-t^4)+\binom{r}{5}t^8(1-t^8)+\cdots \\ &\quad \cdots+\binom{r}{4}t^9(1-t^4)+\binom{r}{6}t^{11}(1-t^8)+\cdots \\ &= (1-t^4)(-t+a(t)+b(t)) \end{aligned}$$

which proves the desired formula. □

Since SU_2 is a compact connected Lie group, the orbit space $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2) = \mathsf{SU}_2^r/\mathsf{SU}_2$ is also a compact connected topological space, with the natural quotient topology. Observe that the degree of $P_t(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)) = 1+t+\frac{t\,Q}{1-t^4}$ is given by (for $r \geq 2$)

$$N = \deg Q - 3 = \max\{\deg f_r + 2, \deg h_r\} - 3 = 3r-3,$$

because the degree of f_r is $r+2$ and the degree of h_r is $3r$.

Lemma B.3. *Let $r \geq 3$ and $N = 3r-3$. (a) The Poincaré polynomial P_t of $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ has degree N and its top coefficient is 1. (b) If $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ is a manifold (with or without boundary), then its dimension is $N = 3r-3$.*

Proof. (a) We have seen that $\deg P_t = N = 3r-3$. To determine its top coefficient for $r \geq 3$, note that the top coefficient of P_t is either the top coefficient of a, when $r = 2k+1$ is odd, or the top coefficient of b, when $r = 2k+2$ is even. According to equations (11) and (12) we have that both the top coefficients of a and b are 1 (in the odd case, $r = 2k+1$, so that $\binom{r}{2k+1}t^{2k+4}t^{4k-4} = 1t^{6k}$, and $6k = 3(r-1)$ and similarly in the even case).

(b) The dimension of $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$ as a semi-algebraic set is $(n^2-1)(r-1)$ for $r \geq 2$, and if it additionally is a topological manifold, the dimensions coincide. All semi-algebraic sets have dense subsets which are manifolds, it is not hard to see that the irreducible representations are all smooth and form a dense subset. Clearly, the projection $\mathsf{SU}_n^r \to \mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_n)$ is locally submersive at irreducible representations (since their stabilizers are zero dimensional) and thus the dimension in this case is easily seen to be the dimension of the tangent space to the representation, $(n^2-1)r$ (since SU_n^r is smooth), minus the dimension of the orbit, which is $n^2 - 1$, since the stabilizer is finite. When $n = 2$, we get the claim. □

We will use the following standard facts (see [Hat02]), namely Poincaré duality. By a closed manifold we mean a connected compact topological manifold without boundary.

Proposition B.4. *Let M be a closed manifold of dimension m. If $\dim H_m(M, \mathbb{Q}) = 1$, then M is orientable.*

Theorem B.5 (Poincaré duality)**.** *Let M be a closed manifold of dimension m, and let $b_k = \dim H_k(M, \mathbb{Q})$ be its k^{th} Betti number. If M is orientable, then $b_k = b_{m-k}$, for all $k = 0, ..., m$.*

Proposition B.6. *Let M be a compact connected manifold of dimension m with non-empty boundary. Then $H_m(M, \mathbb{Q}) = 0$.*

Corollary B.7. *Let $r \geq 3$. If $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ is a manifold possibly with boundary, then $r = 3$.*

Proof. First we show that the polynomial $P_t(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)) = b_0 + b_1 t + \cdots + t^N$, where $b_k = \dim H_k(\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2), \mathbb{Q})$ does not satisfy $b_k = b_{N-k}$, when $r \geq 4$. This is clear by looking at the coefficients. For example, $b_4 = 0$ and, when $r \geq 5$, equations (11) and (12) imply there is always a nonzero coefficient of $N - 4 = 3r - 7$, so that $b_{N-4} \neq 0$. When $r = 4$, we have $P_t = 1 + 4t^6 + t^9$ which does not satisfy Poincaré duality as well. Now suppose $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ is a manifold (with or without boundary). Then Lemma B.3 and Proposition B.6 show that $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ has no boundary. So, $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ is closed of dimension $3r - 3$, and therefore orientable by Proposition B.4. Thus Poincaré duality (Theorem B.5) applies, and we get a contradiction. So, $\mathfrak{X}_r(\mathsf{SU}_2)$ is not a closed manifold for $r \geq 4$. Since it is connected and compact, it is not everywhere locally homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{3r-3}$ or to a half Euclidean space either. □

A similar argument establishes the following theorem.

Theorem B.8. *Whenever the Poincaré polynomial of $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ forbids duality and its top betti number is 1, then $\mathfrak{X}_r(K)$ is not a topological manifold, nor a topological manifold with boundary.*

References

[Bai08] Thomas Baird, *The moduli space of flat g-bundles over a nonorientable surface.*, PhD Dissertation, University of Toronto, 2008.

[BC01] Stuart Bratholdt and Daryl Cooper, *On the topology of the character variety of a free group*, Rend. Istit. Mat. Univ. Trieste **32** (2001), no. suppl. 1, 45–53 (2002), Dedicated to the memory of Marco Reni. MR MR1889465 (2003d:14072)

[Bre72] Glen E. Bredon, *Introduction to compact transformation groups*, Academic Press, New York, 1972, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 46. MR MR0413144 (54 #1265)

[Dré04] Jean-Marc Drézet, *Luna's slice theorem and applications*, Algebraic group actions and quotients, Hindawi Publ. Corp., Cairo, 2004, pp. 39–89. MR MR2210794 (2006k:14082)

[FL09] Carlos A. A. Florentino and Sean Lawton, *The topology of moduli spaces of free group representations*, Math. Ann. **345** (2009), no. 2, 453–489.

[Gol84] William M. Goldman, *The symplectic nature of fundamental groups of surfaces*, Adv. in Math. **54** (1984), no. 2, 200–225. MR MR762512 (86i:32042)

[Gol90] ———, *Convex real projective structures on compact surfaces*, J. Differential Geom. **31** (1990), no. 3, 791–845. MR MR1053346 (91b:57001)

[Har95] Joe Harris, *Algebraic geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 133, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995, A first course, Corrected reprint of the 1992 original. MR MR1416564 (97e:14001)

[Hat02] Allen Hatcher, *Algebraic topology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002. MR MR1867354 (2002k:55001)

[HP04] Michael Heusener and Joan Porti, *The variety of characters in* $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$, Bol. Soc. Mat. Mexicana (3) **10** (2004), no. Special Issue, 221–237. MR MR2199350 (2006m:57020)

[JM87] Dennis Johnson and John J. Millson, *Deformation spaces associated to compact hyperbolic manifolds*, Discrete groups in geometry and analysis (New Haven, Conn., 1984), Progr. Math., vol. 67, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1987, pp. 48–106. MR MR900823 (88j:22010)

[Lan02] Serge Lang, *Algebra*, third ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 211, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002. MR MR1878556 (2003e:00003)

[Law07] Sean Lawton, *Generators, relations and symmetries in pairs of* 3×3 *unimodular matrices*, J. Algebra **313** (2007), no. 2, 782–801. MR MR2329569

[Lun73] Domingo Luna, *Slices étales*, Sur les groupes algébriques, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1973, pp. 81–105. Bull. Soc. Math. France, Paris, Mémoire 33. MR MR0342523 (49 #7269)

[Mos57] G. D. Mostow, *Equivariant embeddings in Euclidean space*, Ann. of Math. (2) **65** (1957), 432–446. MR MR0087037 (19,291c)

[Muk03] Shigeru Mukai, *An introduction to invariants and moduli*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 81, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003, Translated from the 1998 and 2000 Japanese editions by W. M. Oxbury. MR MR2004218 (2004g:14002)

[NR69] M. S. Narasimhan and S. Ramanan, *Moduli of vector bundles on a compact Riemann surface*, Ann. of Math. (2) **89** (1969), 14–51. MR MR0242185 (39 #3518)

[NS65] M. S. Narasimhan and C. S. Seshadri, *Stable and unitary vector bundles on a compact Riemann surface*, Ann. of Math. (2) **82** (1965), 540–567. MR MR0184252 (32 #1725)

[Pro76] C. Procesi, *The invariant theory of* $n \times n$ *matrices*, Advances in Math. **19** (1976), no. 3, 306–381. MR MR0419491 (54 #7512)

[PS85] Claudio Procesi and Gerald Schwarz, *Inequalities defining orbit spaces*, Invent. Math. **81** (1985), no. 3, 539–554. MR MR807071 (87h:20078)

[Sha94] Igor R. Shafarevich, *Basic algebraic geometry. 2*, second ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994, Schemes and complex manifolds, Translated from the 1988 Russian edition by Miles Reid. MR MR1328834 (95m:14002)

[Sik09] Adam S. Sikora, *Character varieties*, arXiv:0902.2589 (2009).

[Wei64] André Weil, *Remarks on the cohomology of groups*, Ann. of Math. (2) **80** (1964), 149–157. MR MR0169956 (30 #199)